

START

WHC-EP-0640

Rev. 1

UC-600

Tank Characterization Data Report: Tank 241-C-112

B. C. Simpson
G. L. Borsheim
L. Jensen

Date Published
September 1993

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Environmental Restoration and
Waste Management



**Westinghouse
Hanford Company**

P.O. Box 1970
Richland, Washington 99352

Hanford Operations and Engineering Contractor for the
U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC06-87RL10930



Approved for Public Release

This page intentionally left blank.

2025-03-10 10:00:00



LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

This report has been reproduced from the best available copy. Available in paper copy and microfiche.

Available to the U.S. Department of Energy
and its contractors from
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
(615) 576-8401

Available to the public from the U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
(703) 487-4650

Printed in the United States of America

DISCLM-1.CHP (1-91)

9313045.0000

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

Document Title: Tank Characterization Data Report: Tank 241-C-112

Prepared by: Brett Simpson 9/22/93
Brett C. Simpson, Advanced Engineer
Analytical Evaluation and Reporting Date

Prepared by: George L. Borsheim 9/22/93
George L. Borsheim, Fellow Engineer
Tank Waste Technology Applications Date

Approved by: Harry Babad 9/24/93
Harry Babad, Advisory Scientist
Waste Tank Safety Programs Date

Approved by: Nicholas W. Kirch 9/23/93
Nicholas W. Kirch, Manager
Tank Waste Technology Applications Date

Approved by: Albert F. Noonan 9/22/93
Albert F. Noonan, Manager
Analytical Evaluation and Reporting Date

Approved by: Robert J. Cash 9/22/93
Robert J. Cash, Manager
Ferrocyanide Safety Technology Date


Approved by: John C. Fulton 9-22-93
John C. Fulton, Manager
Waste Tank Safety Programs Date

Approved by: John G. Propson 9/23/93
John G. Propson, Manager
Characterization Program Date

Approved by: Donald C. Board 9/23/93
Donald C. Board, Manager
Quality Assurance Date

Approved by: Muhammed N. Islam 9/23/93
for Muhammed N. Islam, Manager
Waste Tank Safety Analysis Date

6900 5406136

Date Received: 9-22-93	INFORMATION RELEASE REQUEST	Reference: WHC-CM-3-4
Complete for all Types of Release		
Purpose <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Speech or Presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Full Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Summary <input type="checkbox"/> Abstract <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Aid <input type="checkbox"/> Speakers Bureau <input type="checkbox"/> Poster Session <input type="checkbox"/> Videotape </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reference <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Report <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis or Dissertation <input type="checkbox"/> Manual <input type="checkbox"/> Brochure/Flier <input type="checkbox"/> Software/Database <input type="checkbox"/> Controlled Document <input type="checkbox"/> Other </div> </div>		ID Number (include revision, volume, etc.) WHC-EP-0640 Rev. 1 List attachments. None Date Release Required 9-30-93
Title Tank Characterization Data Report: 241-C-112 Rev. 1		Unclassified Category UC-600 Impact Level 2
New or novel (patentable) subject matter? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If "Yes", has disclosure been submitted by WHC or other company? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Disclosure No(s).		Information received from others in confidence, such as proprietary data, trade secrets, and/or inventions? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Identify)
Copyrights? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If "Yes", has written permission been granted? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Attach Permission)		Trademarks? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Identify)
Complete for Speech or Presentation		
Title of Conference or Meeting		Group or Society Sponsoring
Date(s) of Conference or Meeting	City/State	Will proceedings be published? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Will material be handed out? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Title of Journal		
CHECKLIST FOR SIGNATORIES		
Review Required per WHC-CM-3-4	Yes No	Reviewer - Signature Indicates Approval
		Name (printed) Signature Date
Classification/Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	S. W. Berglin-- O.G.C Memo 2/4/93
Patent - General Counsel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	S. W. Berglin-- O.G.C Memo 2/4/93
Legal - General Counsel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Applied Technology/Export Controlled Information or International Program	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
WHC Program/Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	A. F. Noonan <i>A.F. Noonan</i> 9/22/93
Communications	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RL Program/Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	J. M. Clark <i>J.M. Clark</i> 9/30/93
Publication Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	A. F. Waite <i>A.F. Waite</i> 9/30/93
Other Program/Project	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Information conforms to all applicable requirements. The above information is certified to be correct.		
Yes No References Available to Intended Audience <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Transmit to DOE-HQ/Office of Scientific and Technical Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Author/Requestor (Printed/Signature) Date B. C. Simpson <i>B.C. Simpson</i> 9/22/93 Intended Audience <input type="checkbox"/> Internal <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> External Responsible Manager (Printed/Signature) Date A. F. Noonan <i>A.F. Noonan</i> 9/22/93		INFORMATION RELEASE ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL STAMP Stamp is required before release. Release is contingent upon resolution of mandatory comments.  Date Cancelled Date Disapproved

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tank 241-C-112 is a Hanford Site Ferrocyanide Watch List tank that was most recently sampled in March 1992. Analyses of materials obtained from tank 241-C-112 were conducted to support the resolution of the Ferrocyanide Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) and to support *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*¹ (Tri-Party Agreement) Milestone M-10-00.

Analysis of core samples obtained from tank 241-C-112 strongly indicates that the fuel concentration in the tank waste will not support a propagating exothermic reaction. Analysis of the process history of the tank as well as studies of simulants provided valuable information about the physical and chemical condition of the waste. This information, in combination with the analysis of the tank waste, supports the conclusion that an exothermic reaction in tank 241-C-112 is not plausible. Therefore, the contents of tank 241-C-112 present no imminent threat to the workers at the Hanford Site, the public, or the environment from its ferrocyanide inventory. Because an exothermic reaction is not credible, the consequences of this accident scenario, as promulgated by the General Accounting Office, are not applicable.²

¹Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1992, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*, 2 vols. , Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.

²Peach, J. D., 1990, "Consequences of Explosion of Hanford's Single-Shell Tank are Understated," (Letter B-241479 to C. M. Synar, Chairman of Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives), GAO/RCED-91-34, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

It is probable that tank 241-C-112 exceeds the 1,000 g-mol inventory criteria established for the Ferrocyanide USQ; however, extensive energetic analysis of the waste has determined a maximum exothermic value of -9 cal/g dry waste. This value is substantially below any levels of concern (-75 cal/g).³ In addition, an investigation of potential mechanisms to generate concentration levels of radionuclides high enough to be of concern was performed. No credible mechanism was postulated that could initiate the formation of such concentration levels⁴ in the tank.

Tank 241-C-112 waste is a complex material made up primarily of water and inert salts. The insoluble solids are a mixture of phosphates, sulfates, and hydroxides in combination with aluminum, calcium, iron, nickel, and uranium. Disodium nickel ferrocyanide and sodium cesium nickel ferrocyanide probably exist in the tank; however, there appears to have been significant degradation of this material since the waste was initially settled in the tank. Most of the ¹³⁷Cs precipitated during the scavenging campaign (1955 to 1957)⁵ appears to still remain in the tank in an insoluble form, probably bound with the remaining ferrocyanide. Total cyanide analyses substantiate the energetics results. The soluble analytes are primarily sodium, nitrate, and nitrite (Table ES-1).

³Jewett, J. R., 1992, "Energy Measurements for Disqualifying Waste Tanks from Watch Lists," Meeting Minutes, October 22, 1992, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

⁴Dickinson, D. R., J. M. McLaren, G. L. Borsheim, M. D. Crippen, 1993, *Credibility of Drying Out Ferrocyanide Tank Waste Sludge by Hot Spots*, WHC-EP-0648, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

⁵Borsheim, G. L. and B. C. Simpson, 1991, *An Assessment of the Inventories of the Ferrocyanide Watchlist Tanks*, WHC-SD-WM-ER-133, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.


Comparisons of the calculated bulk inventories for various analytes of concern show that tank 241-C-112 is within established operating safety requirements for heat-load, organic content, and plutonium inventory. A substantial amount of free liquid remains in the tank. However, no effort to remove the remaining liquid is planned because there is less than 189,000 L (50,000 gal) of drainable liquid in the tank (thus meeting stabilization criteria). Tank 241-C-112 is considered a sound, non-leaking tank. Figure ES-1 presents a summary of tank status data for 241-C-112.

Table ES-1.

Estimated Major Analyte Inventory	Water	Na	NO ₃ ⁻	U	NO ₂ ⁻	P	Fe	Ca	Ni	Al	TOC
Avg. Wt% (wet solids)	53.0	9.3	5.7	5.0	4.2	2.4	1.9	1.5	1.3	1.0	0.4
Estimated Total Mass of Waste in 241-C-112 (range): 608-611 Mg Supernate: 48-175 Mg Wet Solids: 434-563 Mg											
Estimated Fission Product Inventory Range						¹³⁷ Cs		⁹⁰ Sr			
Bulk Inventory, Ci (wet solids)						217,200-286,000		162,000-183,500			
Heat Generation, w						1,025-1,350		1,090-1,230			
Estimated Plutonium/ Americium Inventory Range			²³⁸ Pu		^{239/240} Pu		²⁴¹ Am				
Bulk Inventory, Ci (wet solids)			5.9-7.7		67.3-87.1		330-430				
Bulk Inventory, g (wet solids)			0.34-0.44		1,100-1,400		100-125				
Analyte			Safety Issue Criteria					Calculated/Measured Value			
Na ₂ NiFe(CN) ₆ (wet solids)			1000 g-mol					8,700-11,500 g-mol			
ΔH (dry basis)			-75 cal					-9 cal			
^{239/240} Pu			50 kg					1.1-1.4 kg			
Temperature			300°F (149°C)					85°F (29°C)			
Heat Load			11.72 kw					2.26-2.44 kw			
Organic Content (TOC, dry basis)			3.0 wt% TOC (10% sodium acetate equivalent)					0.75 wt% TOC			

9212045.0073

Tank: 241-C-112



Riser and Drywell Locations
Tank 241-C-112

Tank Description

Type: Single Shell
Constructed: 1944
In-service: 11/46
Out of Service: 1976
Diameter: 75'
Usable Depth: 16'
Capacity: 530K gallons
Bottom shape: Dish
Hanford Coordinates:
43,074' North
48,398' West
Ventilation: Passive

Leak Detection System

Surface Level:
FIC Riser- None
Manual Tape Riser- R-08
LOW Riser(s)- None

Number of External Drywells: 4
Number of Lateral Wells: None

Tank Status

Watch List: *Ferrocyanide*

Contents

Type: Non-Complexed Waste
Total Waste: 104K gallons
Supernate Volume: 0K gallons
Drainable Interstitial Liquid: 32K gallons

Isolation Status

Date Partially Interim Isolated: 12/15/82
Date Interim Stabilized: 09/90

Surface Level/Leak Status

Integrity Category: Sound
Manual Tape Surface Level: 33.50 Inches (12/28/92)
Last Photographed: 09/18/90

Temperature Status

Highest temperature during 1992:
90.50 deg F (08/09/92)

Comments:
Temperatures are stable.

Drywell Status

Comments:
Current drywell profiles were stable and consistent with established baseline profiles.

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	PURPOSE	1-1
1.2	SCOPE	1-1
2.0	PRESAMPLING INFORMATION AND EVALUATION	2-1
2.1	BACKGROUND	2-1
2.1.1	Tank 241-C-112 History	2-1
2.1.2	Unreviewed Safety Question Declaration	2-6
2.2	EXPECTED TANK CONTENTS/CONDITIONS	2-8
2.3	ANALYTICAL RESULTS FROM SIMULANT STUDIES	2-10
2.3.1	Simulant Formulation: In Farm 2 Flowsheet Material	2-10
2.3.2	Simulant Physical Characteristics	2-11
2.3.3	Chemical Composition	2-12
2.3.4	Energetics Behavior of Ferrocyanide Sludge Simulant	2-12
3.0	CORE SAMPLING	3-1
3.1	DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLING EVENT	3-1
3.2	CHAIN OF CUSTODY	3-1
4.0	SAMPLE PREPARATION/SAMPLE EXTRUSION	4-1
4.1	DESCRIPTION OF GAMMA SCANNING EFFORT	4-1
4.1.1	Core 34	4-1
4.1.2	Core 35	4-1
4.1.3	Core 36	4-4
4.1.4	Tank 241-C-112 Gamma Scanning Summary	4-4
4.2	DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE HANDLING AND ANALYTICAL SCHEME	4-6
4.2.1	Sample Breakdown Procedure	4-6
4.2.2	Homogenization Tests	4-7
4.2.3	Subsegment-Level Analyses	4-7
4.2.4	Rheological and Physical Measurements	4-9
4.2.5	Subsegment Level Archive	4-9
4.2.6	Core Composite Level Analysis	4-10
5.0	ANALYTICAL RESULTS: TANK 241-C-112	5-1
5.1	TANK 241-C-112 CORE SAMPLE RECOVERY	5-1
5.2	TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM PROGRAM ELEMENT CHARACTERIZATION SYNOPSIS	5-3
5.2.1	Retrieval Program Characterization Data Summary	5-4
5.2.2	Pretreatment Program Characterization Summary	5-4
5.2.3	Waste Tank Safety Program Characterization Data Summary	5-5
5.2.4	Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant Program Characterization Data Summary	5-10
5.3	TANK 241-C-112 CORE SAMPLE RHEOLOGICAL/PHYSICAL MEASUREMENTS	5-11
5.3.1	Shear Strength	5-12
5.3.2	Viscosity as a Function of Shear Rate	5-12
5.3.3	Slurry Flow Properties	5-14
5.3.4	Particle Size Measurement	5-14
5.3.5	Settling Behavior of Diluted Samples	5-17

CONTENTS (continued)

5.4	ANALYTICAL RESULTS--INDUCTIVELY COUPLED PLASMA- ATOMIC EMISSION SPECTROSCOPY	5-20
5.4.1	Inductively Coupled Plasma Assays--General Comments	5-20
5.4.2	Core 34	5-24
5.4.3	Core 35	5-25
5.4.4	Core 36	5-26
5.5	ANALYTICAL RESULTS--ION CHROMATOGRAPHY	5-27
5.5.1	Ion Chromatography Assays--General Comments	5-27
5.5.2	Core 34	5-27
5.5.3	Core 35	5-30
5.5.4	Core 36	5-31
5.6	ANALYTICAL RESULTS--RADIOCHEMISTRY	5-31
5.6.1	Radiochemistry Assays--General Comments	5-31
5.6.2	Core 34 Radiochemistry	5-34
5.6.3	Core 35 Radiochemistry	5-34
5.6.4	Core 36 Radiochemistry	5-34
5.7	ANALYTICAL RESULTS--ENERGETICS	5-34
5.7.1	Remarks on the Interpretation of Differential Scanning Calorimetry/Thermogravimetric Analysis Data	5-35
5.7.2	General Comments on the Differential Scanning Calorimetry/Thermogravimetric Analysis Behavior of the Samples	5-38
5.8	ANALYTICAL RESULTS - POTENTIAL WASTE CONSTITUENTS	5-41
5.8.1	Mass Balances	5-41
5.8.2	Suggested Components of Waste Matrix	5-43
5.8.3	Comparison to Theoretical Estimates and Simulant Studies	5-44
5.9	RCRA-TYPE ANALYSIS: DATA VALIDATION/VERIFICATION PROTOCOL	5-45
5.9.1	Chemical Data	5-45
5.9.2	Radiological Data	5-46
6.0	INTERPRETATION OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS	6-1
6.1	TANK 241-C-112 WASTE PROFILE	6-1
6.2	REVIEW OF THE SUBSEGMENT ANALYTE PROFILES	6-2
6.2.1	Tank Entrance/Exit Effects on Analyte Distribution	6-3
6.2.2	Comparisons with the Borsheim/ Simpson Model Estimates	6-7
6.3	CALCULATED BULK INVENTORIES OF SELECTED ANALYTES	6-9
6.4	GAMMA SCANNING OF CORE SAMPLE SEGMENTS	6-12
7.0	QUANTITATIVE/STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	7-1
7.1	CONCENTRATION ESTIMATES	7-2
7.2	HOMOGENIZATION TESTS	7-6
7.3	COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SIMULATED CORE COMPOSITE AND THE CORE COMPOSITE	7-8
7.3.1	Core 36 Statistical Methods	7-8
7.3.2	Core 34 Statistical Methods	7-9
7.3.3	Results from Cores 34 and 36	7-9
7.4	SPATIAL VARIABILITY AND ANALYTICAL ERROR ESTIMATION	7-9

CONTENTS (continued)

8.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8-1
8.1	ANALYTICAL RESULTS	8-1
8.2	ENERGETICS ANALYSIS	8-2
8.3	RECOMMENDATIONS	8-3
9.0	REFERENCES	9-1

APPENDIXES

A	CALCULATIONS	A-1
B	STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION	B-1
C	MISCELLANEOUS DATA	C-1
D	QUALITY ASSURANCE DOCUMENTATION SUMMARY	D-1

LIST OF FIGURES

2-1	Typical Single-Shell Tank Diagram	2-2
2-2	In Farm Flowsheet	2-4
2-3	Solids and Liquid Wastes - Tank 241-C-112	2-7
2-4	Ferrocyanide Tank 3-Component Diagram	2-14
3-1	Tank 241-C-112 Riser Configuration	3-2
4-4	Typical Single-Shell Tank Segment Extrusion	4-6
5-1	Current Condition of Tank 241-C-112	5-2
5-2	Segments 1 and 2, Core 34 Measurements and Observations	5-7
5-3	Segments 1 and 2, Core 35 Measurements and Observations	5-8
5-4	Segments 1 and 2, Core 36 Measurements and Observations	5-9
5-5	Core 34, Particle Size Number Density	5-16
5-6	Core 36, Particle Size Number Density	5-16
5-7	Single-Shell Tank Core 34, Particle Size Volume Density	5-18
5-8	Single-Shell Tank Core 36, Particle Size Volume Density	5-19
5-9	Settling Rate Data for Tank 241-C-112 Core 36, 1:1 Dilution	5-21
5-10	Settling Rate Data for Tank 241-C-112 Core 36, 3:1 Dilution	5-21
6-1	Elevation and Plan of Tank 241-C-112	6-4
6-2A	Waste Profile of Tank 241-C-112	6-5
6-2B	Alternative Waste Profile of Tank 241-C-112	6-6

LIST OF TABLES

2-1	Expected Concentrations for Characteristic Analytes	2-9
2-2	Feed Solution Composition for In Farm 2 Flowsheet	2-10
2-3	Summary of In Farm 2 Simulant Characterization Data	2-11
2-4	Estimated Composition of Homogenized, Centrifuged, Ferrocyanide Sludge Simulant	2-12
2-5	Heats of Reaction of Various Simulants	2-13
3-1	Core 34--Chain-of-Custody Summary	3-3
3-2	Core 35--Chain-of-Custody Summary	3-3
3-3	Core 36--Chain-of-Custody Summary	3-4
4-1	Subsegment-Level Analysis	4-8
5-1	Tank 241-C-112 Core Sample Description Summary	5-1
5-2	Tank 241-C-112 Core Sample Physical Characteristics Summary	5-3
5-3	Retrieval Program Data Summary	5-4
5-4	Pretreatment Program Data Summary	5-5
5-5	Core Composite Transuranics (fusion preparation)	5-5
5-6	Plutonium Isotopic Distribution	5-6
5-7	HWVP Process Stream Analytes of Concern	5-11
5-8	HWVP Regulatory Operation Analytes of Concern	5-11
5-9	Power-Law Model Parameters for Tank 241-C-112 Material	5-13
5-10	Turbulent Flow Model Calculations	5-14
5-11	Particle Size Distribution by Number: 97% < 2 μ m (both cores)	5-15
5-12	Particle Size Distribution by Volume: 100% < 30 μ m (34-2D); 100% < 85 μ m (36)	5-17
5-13	Physical Properties Summary	5-20
5-14	Water Digestion Chemical Composite Data--ICP Average Values	5-22
5-15	Acid Digestion Chemical Composite Data--ICP Average Values	5-22
5-16	Fusion Digestion Chemical Composite Data--ICP Average Values	5-23
5-17	Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 ICP Analyte Trending (fusion prep on subsegments)	5-23
5-18	Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 ICP Analyte Trending (fusion prep on subsegments)	5-24
5-19	Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 ICP Analyte Trending (fusion prep on subsegments)	5-24
5-20	Anion Analysis--Composite Data Results	5-28
5-21	Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 IC Analyte Trending	5-28
5-22	Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 IC Analyte Trending	5-29
5-23	Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 IC Analyte Trending	5-29
5-24	Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Misc. Analyte Trending	5-29
5-25	Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 Misc. Analyte Trending	5-30
5-26	Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Misc. Analyte Trending	5-30
5-27	Core Composite Fission Products (fusion prep)	5-32
5-28	Core Composite Uranium	5-32
5-29	Core Composite Transuranics (fusion preparation)	5-32
5-30	Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Radionuclide Trending (fusion preparation)	5-33
5-31	Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 Radionuclide Trending (fusion preparation)	5-33
5-32	Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Radionuclide Trending (fusion preparation)	5-33
5-33	Thermogravimetric Analysis Results from Tank 241-C-112	5-36

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

5-34	Differential Scanning Calorimetry Energetics Results from Tank 241-C-112	5-37
5-35	Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Energetic Comparison	5-38
5-36	Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Energetic Comparison	5-39
5-37	Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Energetics Trending	5-40
5-38	Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 Energetics Trending	5-40
5-39	Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Energetics Trending	5-40
5-40	Adjusted Mass Balance: Core 34 Composite	5-42
5-41	Adjusted Mass Balance: Core 35 Composite	5-42
5-42	Adjusted Mass Balance: Core 36 Composite	5-43
5-43	Probable Solids in the Waste Matrix	5-43
5-44	Tank 241-C-112 Comparison of Waste Material with Simulants for Selected Analytes	5-45
6-1	Comparisons of Initial and Revised Borsheim/Simpson Model Estimates with Values Calculated from Analytical Results	6-7
6-2	Energetics Related Analyte Values	6-10
6-3	Fission Product Inventory	6-10
6-4	Plutonium/Americium Inventory	6-11
6-5	ICP Major Cation Inventory (Fusion Preparation)	6-11
6-6	Energetics Related Analyte Values	6-11
6-7	Fission Product Inventory	6-11
6-8	Plutonium/Americium Inventory	6-12
6-9	ICP Major Cation Inventory (Fusion Preparation)	6-12
7-1	Acid Digestion Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	7-3
7-2	Potassium Hydroxide Fusion Dissolution Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	7-4
7-3	Water Leach Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	7-5
7-4	Radiochemistry Statistics ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	7-6
7-5	Ion Chromatography Anion Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	7-6
7-6	Homogenization Test Results	7-7
7-7	Segment vs. Composite Statistics for Core 34	7-10
7-8	Segment vs. Composite Statistics for Core 36	7-11
7-9	Acid Digestion Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates	7-13
7-10	Water Leach Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates	7-14
7-11	Potassium Hydroxide/Nickel Fusion Dissolution Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates	7-15
7-12	Radiochemistry Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates	7-15
7-13	Ion Chromatography Anion Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates	7-15
8-1	Comparison of Tank 241-C-112 Analyte Values to Safety Issue Criteria	8-3

LIST OF ACRONYMS

1C	first decontamination cycle
AA	atomic absorption
AEA	alpha energy analysis
ANOVA	analysis of variance
CI	confidence interval
CST	core sampling truck
DLC	drainable liquid composites
DSC	differential scanning calorimetry
GAO	General Accounting Office
GC	gas chromatograph
GEA	gamma energy analysis
HASM	Hanford Analytical Services Management
HDW-EIS	<i>Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Hanford Defense High-Level, Transuranic and Tank Wastes</i>
HWVP	Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant
IC	ion chromatography
ICP	inductively coupled plasma - atomic emission spectroscopy
LCS	laboratory control samples
MS	mass spectrometer
NCAW	neutralized current acid waste
PNL	Pacific Northwest Laboratory
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
RPD	relative percent difference
SOW	statement of work
SST	single-shell tank
TC	total carbon
TGA	thermogravimetric analysis
TIC	total inorganic carbon
TOC	total organic carbon
TOD	total oxygen demand
Tri-Party Agreement	<i>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order</i>
UR	uranium recovery
USQ	unreviewed safety question

This page intentionally left blank.

TANK CHARACTERIZATION DATA REPORT: TANK 241-C-112

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Analysis was conducted on materials obtained from tank 241-C-112 to support the closure of the ferrocyanide unreviewed safety question (USQ). Obtaining measurements that determine overall waste energetics is a key step in closing the ferrocyanide USQ and safety issue. In addition, several of the analytes contributing to the energetic properties of the waste need to be measured as a function of position (e.g., total cyanide and nitrate/nitrite present, water content, and the distribution and inventory of ¹³⁷Cs and ⁹⁰Sr in the tank). Other objectives that these measurements and inventory estimates support are as follows.

- Complete *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Tri-Party Agreement) Milestone M-10-00 (Ecology et al. 1992) to sample and analyze two cores from each tank.
- Obtain estimates of both the concentration and total quantity of key analytes relating to other safety issues, such as organics and radionuclides.
- Provide input to risk assessment-based disposal decisions for the waste.
- Implement physical property measurements, such as rheology, bulk density, and particle size. These measurements are necessary for the design and fabrication of retrieval, pretreatment, and final waste disposal systems.

1.1 PURPOSE

This report summarizes the available information regarding the waste in tank 241-C-112, and arranges this information in a useful format for data users in various internal and external organizations.

1.2 SCOPE

This report presents a broad background of preliminary information that was available prior to core sampling, which initially guided the development of the sampling and analysis program. This material includes historical information about the ferrocyanide-scavenging program, transfer records, observations from in-tank photographs, and inferences from waste simulant studies. The results of tank 241-C-112 core sample analyses are summarized and presented, along with a statistical interpretation of the data. The information obtained from historical sources and synthetic waste studies are compared with the actual waste measurements in this report.

This page intentionally left blank.

2.0 PRESAMPLING INFORMATION AND EVALUATION

2.1 BACKGROUND


Radioactive wastes from defense operations have accumulated at the Hanford Site in underground waste tanks since the 1940's. During the 1950's, additional tank storage space was required to support the United States defense mission. To obtain additional tank storage volume within a short period of time and to minimize construction of additional storage tanks, Hanford Site scientists developed a process to scavenge radiocesium from tank waste liquids (Sloat 1954, Abrams 1956). Ferrocyanide compounds were used in a carrier-precipitation process to scavenge ^{137}Cs and other soluble radionuclides from the Hanford Site waste tanks. This treatment was used on U Plant waste effluent, bismuth phosphate first decontamination cycle waste, and selected wastes that had been previously discharged to the tanks. The radionuclides settled in the waste tanks and the supernate was discharged to the cribs and trenches. As a result of this process, occupied waste volume in the waste tanks was greatly reduced, while minimizing the amount of long-lived radionuclides discharged to the ground.

In implementing this process, approximately 140 metric tons of ferrocyanide [as $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$] were added to the tanks. The bulk of the ferrocyanide material is believed to remain in 18 to 24 single-shell tanks (SSTs). Ferrocyanide is a stable complex of iron(II) ion and cyanide, whose compounds are considered nontoxic because they do not appreciably dissociate in aqueous solutions (Burger 1984). In the presence of oxidizing materials such as nitrates and/or nitrites, ferrocyanide compounds can undergo uncontrolled exothermic reactions in the laboratory by heating them to high temperatures (above 280°C [540°F]). The reactive nature of ferrocyanide in the presence of an oxidizer has been known for decades, but the conditions under which the compound can undergo exothermic reactions have not been thoroughly studied. Because the scavenging process involved precipitating ferrocyanides from solutions containing nitrate and nitrite, the potential for a reactive mixture of ferrocyanides and nitrates/nitrites in the SSTs must be evaluated.

2.1.1 Tank 241-C-112 History

Groups of waste tanks that were physically located together and built at the same time are called tank farms at the Hanford Site. The original tank farms (B, C, T, U) were built in 1943-1944. Tank 241-C-112 was placed into service in 1946. Each tank has a diameter of 22.9 m (75 ft), an operating depth of 5.2 m (17 ft), and a nominal capacity of 2 million liters (530,000 gal). The basic design of a typical SST is shown in Figure 2-1. The tank was constructed of reinforced concrete with a mild steel liner covering its bottom and sides. The top of the tank is a concrete dome. Tanks such as 241-C-112 were all covered by at least 1.8 m (6 ft) of soil for shielding purposes (Anderson 1990). The tanks in the tank farms were connected in groups of three or four and overflowed from one to another (known as a cascade). Tank 241-C-112 is the last tank in a cascade that includes 241-C-110 and 241-C-111.

Figure 2-1. Typical Single-Shell Tank Diagram.



Schematic - Not to Scale

28905008.2

Note: Tank 241-C-112 has a dished bottom.

Cascades served several functions in Hanford Site waste management operations. By cascading tanks, fewer connections needed to be made during waste disposal; consequently, all three tanks were usable without having to connect the active waste transfer line directly to each individual tank. This handling method reduced the likelihood for personnel exposure to the waste and diminished the chances for a loss of tank integrity because of overfilling. Another benefit of the cascades was clarification of the wastes. When used in this manner, most of the solids in the waste slurries routed to the tanks settled in the first tank (241-C-110), and the clarified liquids cascaded on to the other tanks in the series (241-C-111 and 241-C-112). Supernate from the final tank in a cascade series was sometimes routed to a disposal trench. In this way clarification reduced the potential amount of radiological contamination to the environment.


The first type of waste that tank 241-C-112 received and stored was first decontamination cycle waste from the bismuth phosphate process (1946 to 1952). This waste would be comparatively high in bismuth, phosphate, and aluminum because aluminum decladding waste was combined with it. The waste was disposed to ground in 1952, leaving a 57,000-L (15,000-gal) heel. The tank was refilled with unscavenged uranium recovery (UR) waste in 1953 and 1954 (Anderson 1990). The UR waste solids were comparatively high in uranium and iron, and low in bismuth and aluminum. The available records do not show whether these wastes were added directly to the tank or through the cascade overflow line from tank 241-C-111. Neither of these waste types had any significant fuel content or heat-generating radionuclides (^{137}Cs or ^{90}Sr) that could contribute to the exothermic potential posed by the ferrocyanide wastes. In late 1955, tank 241-C-112 was emptied. The tank was then used for settling scavenged ferrocyanide waste until 1958. During ferrocyanide-scavenging operations, waste was not cascaded through the 241-C-110, -111, -112 series. Tank 241-C-112 received the waste slurry in direct transfers from the process vessel (General Electric 1958).

Beginning in May 1955, unscavenged UR waste already stored in 200 East Area underground tanks at the Hanford Site was routed to the 244-CR vault for scavenging (refer to Figure 2-2). The 244-CR vault facility contained stainless steel tanks with chemical addition, agitation, and sampling capabilities. The pH was adjusted with HNO_3 and/or NaOH to $\text{pH } 9.3 \pm 0.7$, and $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$ and Ni^{2+} ion were added (generally to 0.005 M each) to precipitate ^{137}Cs . If laboratory analysis of the feed tank indicated additional ^{90}Sr decontamination was necessary, calcium nitrate was also added (Sloat 1955). There was also an effort to scavenge ^{60}Co with Na_2S . The scavenged waste was then routed to another tank for settling, sampling, and decantation to a crib. The settling tanks for this "In Farm scavenged" waste were 241-C-108, 241-C-109, 241-C-111, and 241-C-112. These tanks are expected to exhibit significant similarity in chemical content and physical properties. However, no firm conclusions can yet be made, since it is the only tank of this group with analytical results available.

The In Farm precipitate comprises approximately 20 to 25 percent of the total ferrocyanide material in the Hanford Site tank farms. This material is expected to possess a much higher ferrocyanide concentration content than the more prevalent (70 percent of the total ferrocyanide material) U Plant material. Analytes that differentiate ferrocyanide waste from other wastes are nickel, calcium, and ^{137}Cs .

Figure 2-2. In Farm Flowsheet.

Ferrocyanide Production by "In-Farm" Flowsheet



H9111028.29

Over time, additional gravity settling may have compressed the waste layers, increasing the concentration of some of these analytes. However, the effect of radiation and high pH conditions from later waste additions on the waste matrix is largely unknown. Exposure of the waste to these conditions is believed to have degraded the ferrocyanide. However, laboratory results confirming that hypothesis are still pending (Lilga et al. 1992; Babad et al. 1993).

The first transfer of scavenged waste for settling was in the fourth quarter of 1955. In Farm scavenging was completed in December 1957 (General Electric 1958). The inventory of solids in tank 241-C-112 at the end of the ferrocyanide-scavenging program, as calculated by the Borsheim-Simpson (1991) model, was 318,000 L (84,000 gal) with essentially no free supernate. The scavenging record (General Electric 1958) gives the tank level as 0.67 m (2 ft 2.5 in.) (323,000 L [85,400 gal]). *A History of the 200 Area Tank Farms* (Anderson 1990) reports a total volume of 318,000 L (84,000 gal), but lists only 174,000 L (46,000 gal) of that inventory as solids.

After the end of scavenging in late 1957, tank 241-C-112 remained in active service. However, the tank had relatively limited activity from 1958 to the end of its service life in 1980. The volume is shown as increasing by 189,000 L (50,000 gal) of liquid to approximately 507,000 L (134,000 gal) in the fourth quarter of 1958, but no incoming or outgoing transfers were noted. In the third and fourth quarters of 1960, a total of 996,000 L (263,000 gal) of highly alkaline cladding waste (a waste known to contain substantial amounts of solids) was added to the tank, but the reported solids inventory (174,000 L [46,000 gal]) did not change (Anderson 1990). Cladding waste solids would have settled on top of the ferrocyanide sludge already present.

Several small transfers with relatively high concentrations of ⁹⁰Sr occurred after 1958. Waste from the strontium semiworks/hot semiworks was added to the tank with the total volume listed as 2.07 M L (547,000 gal) at the end of 1964 (the reported solids inventory was still only 174,000 L [46,000 gal]). The listed volumes for the first quarter report in 1965 are a total volume of 2.04 M L (538,000 gal), with a solids volume of 485,000 L (128,000 gal) (Anderson 1990). This solids level measurement was apparently the first since additional waste was added to the tank following the last scavenging pumpout in 1958.

The reported waste volume remained essentially unchanged (between 2.01 and 2.04 M L [532,000 and 538,000 gal]) until a transfer of 1.29 M L (340,000 gal) to tank 241-C-104 in the first quarter of 1970. This transfer left a heel of at least 727,000 L (192,000 gal). A floating suction pump transfer would not have transferred any solids because the maximum reported solids level was 485,000 L (128,000 gal). In early 1970, some B Plant ion-exchange waste (1.24 M L [327,000 gal]) from tank 241-C-110 and drainage to the C-301 catch tank (79,000 L [21,000 gal]) was added to tank 241-C-112. Between 1970 and 1975, the reported solids volume ranged between 454,000 and 522,000 L (120,000 and 138,000 gal), and the total volume reported decreased from 2.06 M L to 2.01 M L (543,000 to 532,000 gal) (Anderson 1990).

Tank 241-C-112 was suspected of leaking and was emptied of pumpable liquid to tank 241-C-103 in 1975-1976 (Anderson 1990); later surveillance never confirmed the suspected leak. Some solids may have been transferred, as

the reported tank solids volume decreased from 485,000 L (128,000 gal) to 413,000 L (109,000 gal). However, the solids transferred would have been those that settled on top of the ferrocyanide solids (i.e., cladding waste solids). The previously calculated volume of ferrocyanide sludge was 318,000 L (84,000 gal), with reported volumes ranging between 174,000 and 323,000 L (46,000 and 85,400 gal). Sludge volume in the tank may have decreased between 1958 and 1975 with further settling and compaction from the weight of overlying solids. However, the volume of the ferrocyanide sludge would not have increased during that time frame. There was no mixing equipment in tank 241-C-112 to move the settled ferrocyanide solids into the overlying solids layer. Therefore, it was concluded that no appreciable volume of ferrocyanide solids were transferred to tank 241-C-103 (Borsheim and Simpson 1991). Appendix A has the results of a model that represents the inventory changes in the tanks with various initial conditions and solid formation values after scavenging operations were completed.

The last major waste type was aluminum cladding waste. These materials would be high in aluminum and silica, with a very high pH. However, the solids volume contribution to the tank is unknown because the majority of the solids would be deposited in the first tank to receive the wastes, which was not tank 241-C-112. The high pH of this waste is considered a significant factor affecting the state of the waste matrix. Other wastes had discernable impacts on the bulk characteristics of the tank contents as well. The strontium semiworks waste had a small volume of waste added, but would have a very high ^{90}Sr content because it included strontium recovery and purification waste losses. The B Plant ion-exchange waste was primarily liquid and was not expected to contribute significantly to the solids in the tank. Figure 2-3 presents a timeline histogram showing the waste deposition and stratification in tank 241-C-112, as indicated from the fill history.

2.1.2 Unreviewed Safety Question Declaration

Efforts have been underway since the mid-1980's to evaluate the potential of a ferrocyanide combustion reaction in Hanford Site SSTs (Burger 1989; Burger and Scheele 1990; Burger 1984). In 1987, the *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Hanford Defense High Level, Transuranic and Tank Wastes*, hereinafter referred to as the HDW-EIS (DOE 1987), was issued. In the HDW-EIS, it was projected that the bounding "worst-case" accident in a ferrocyanide tank would be an explosion resulting in a subsequent short-term radiation dose to the public of 200 mrem.

A later General Accounting Office (GAO) study (Peach 1990) postulated greater "worst-case" accident consequences, with independently calculated doses one to two orders of magnitude greater than the HDW-EIS. A special Hanford Site Ferrocyanide Task Team was commissioned in September 1990 to address all issues involving the ferrocyanide tanks, including the consequences of a potential accident. On October 9, 1990, the Secretary of Energy announced that a supplemental environmental impact statement would be prepared containing an updated analysis of safety issues for the Hanford Site SSTs, including a hypothetical ferrocyanide explosion. In October 1990, the ferrocyanide issue was also declared an USQ because the consequences of the accident scenario (as calculated by the GAO) were outside the bounds of the current safety analyses for SSTs. Furthermore, additional monitoring of tanks with designated USQs was mandated by Public Law 101-510 (1990).

29308095.10



Using a computer model output (Jungfleisch 1984), process knowledge, and transfer records, 24 waste tanks have been identified at the Hanford Site as potentially containing 1,000 g-mol (465 lb) or more of ferrocyanide as the $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$ ion. On further investigation, six of these tanks are believed to have received less than 1,000 g-mol of ferrocyanide sludge and are therefore candidates for removal from the Watch List (Cash 1993). Tank 241-C-112 is on the Ferrocyanide Watch List because it was a known process tank during the ferrocyanide-scavenging campaigns.

2.2 EXPECTED TANK CONTENTS/CONDITIONS

Process knowledge obtained from historical records and waste simulants produced from the scavenging process flowsheets can be used to predict the major constituents and some general physical properties of the waste matrix in the waste tanks. Initially, the differences between the U Plant and In Farm ferrocyanide sludges were not fully appreciated. However, further investigation of the simulants showed that the In Farm process would be expected to precipitate approximately 1.0 to 1.3 vol% solids, and thus the sludge would have been deposited in the receiver tanks in layers approximately 3.6 to 6.1 cm (1.4 to 2.4 in.) thick. This is much less than the 4.25 vol% and 15- to 20-cm (6- to 8-in.) layers expected from the U Plant material. The In Farm scavenged ferrocyanide tanks (such as tank 241-C-112) are expected to contain relatively soft sludge, which can be push-mode sampled. This expectation was supported by inspection of in-tank photographs. The other waste solids that were added to the tank after the scavenging campaign are also expected to be soft. During its operating history, tank 241-C-112 was never subject to any of the various in-tank solidification processes; consequently, there was no formation of hard salt cake on top of the sludge (as there was in the BY Tank Farm). No records of any previous core sampling have been found.

The most recent waste inventory measurement for tank 241-C-112 reports 394,000 L (104,000 gal) of waste with an estimated 121,000 L (~32,000 gal) of drainable liquids (Hanlon 1992). These figures translate to a waste depth of 115.1 cm (45.3 in.) at the tank centerline. Because the tank had less than 189,000 L (50,000 gal) of drainable liquid, it was administratively interim-stabilized in September 1990, and is considered sound. Tank Farm Operations has installed a second thermocouple tree in tank 241-C-112, and the readings between the two thermocouple trees on opposite sides of the tank are consistent. The present maximum waste temperature in tank 241-C-112 is ~29 °C (85 °F), and the estimated heat load in the tank is less than 2.93 kW (10,000 Btu/hr). Tank 241-C-112 is considered to have one of the highest ferrocyanide concentrations of all the ferrocyanide Watch List SSTs (Borsheim and Simpson 1991).

In summary, various nickel ferrocyanide complexes (primarily disodium) are expected to be mixed with an interstitial solution containing sodium nitrate and nitrite. Cesium-137 is expected to be present as a mixed salt (possibly as $\text{NaCsNiFe}(\text{CN})_6$); strontium-90 may be in several potential compounds: phosphate, sulfate, or carbonate. Both of these radionuclides have decayed through slightly more than one half-life, and therefore are not as abundant as when the scavenging waste was originally deposited. Other fission products with relatively short half-lives (such as ^{60}Co and ^{106}Ru) are

not expected to be in abundance, especially with the limited number of waste additions for this tank. Hydrated transition metal oxides/hydroxides (including small amounts of transuranics) are also expected because of alkaline conditions. Other ions expected to be present are potassium, calcium, aluminum, and uranium. The supernate and interstitial liquid is expected to contain large amounts of sodium, nitrate, and nitrite ions. Table 2-1 presents estimates of some typical characteristic analyte concentrations in the waste streams disposed of in 241-C-112.

Table 2-1. Expected Concentrations for Characteristic Analytes (Schneider 1951; Jeppson and Wong 1993).

Waste Type	Identifier Analytes	Typical Process Stream Concentration ($\mu\text{g/g}$ wet solids)
First Decontamination Cycle (1C)	Bi	7,100
	F	9,600
	U	620
	Si	2,400
Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR)	U	1,700 - 32,500
Ferrocyanide (FeCN)	Ni	18,700
	Ca	30,000
	CN	91,000 - 113,000
Decladding Waste (CW)	Al	18,700
	U	340
	Si	2,600
Hot Semiworks (HS)	^{90}Sr	No Data - Expected elevated ^{90}Sr levels

2.3 ANALYTICAL RESULTS FROM SIMULANT STUDIES

Physical and chemical measurements performed on simulants of ferrocyanide tank waste provide additional information and perspective regarding the condition and properties of the waste in tank 241-C-112.

2.3.1 Simulant Formulation: In Farm 2 Flowsheet Material

The In Farm 2 flowsheet material is considered to be an energetically conservative but reasonably close physical and chemical analogue of the ferrocyanide precipitate in tank 241-C-112 as it was deposited in the tank during the scavenging campaign. The In Farm 2 flowsheet materials were prepared according to the following instructions (Jeppson and Wong 1993). The feed solution composition is listed in Table 2-2. Deionized water was used for feed solution and chemical addition makeup.

Table 2-2. Feed Solution Composition for In Farm 2 Flowsheet.

Component	Concentration (mol/L)
Sodium Nitrate (NaNO_3)	3.75 <u>M</u>
Cesium Nitrate (CsNO_3)	0.00025 <u>M</u>
Sodium Nitrite (NaNO_2)	1.25 <u>M</u>
Sodium Sulfate (Na_2SO_4)	0.17 <u>M</u>
Sodium Phosphate (Na_3PO_4)	0.16 <u>M</u>

The product sludge was the precipitate produced when performing the following steps. This procedure mimicked the actual In Farm 2 process that is illustrated in Figure 2-2. The feed solution was heated to 40 °C and the pH adjusted to 9.1 ± 0.5 . The sodium ferrocyanide was then added to the solution, followed by nickel sulfate. The simulant solution was agitated for 1 hour, then struck with calcium nitrate. After the addition of calcium nitrate, the solution was agitated for another hour and allowed to settle. The settling was done for eight days and the supernate was decanted. The remaining sludge was centrifuged at 2,100 g for 14 hours and 1,820 g for 7 days in an attempt to simulate 3.6 and 30 gravity-years of settling respectively (Jeppson and Wong 1993). Selected physical properties for the two settled centrifuged sludges are presented in Table 2-3. Table 2-4 presents an estimate of the chemical composition of the In Farm 2 simulant.

2.3.2 Simulant Physical Characteristics (see Jeppson and Wong 1993)

Table 2-3. Summary of In Farm 2 Simulant Characterization Data.

	Property	In Farm 2 sludge
30 gravity year	Water content, sludge	51 wt%
	pH, supernatant	9.42
	Bulk density, sludge	1.39 g/mL
3.6 gravity year	Bulk density, supernate	1.27 g/mL
	Particle density (dried sludge)	2.38 g/mL
	Particle size distribution, (by number)	97% < 2 μm median diameter**: 0.76, 0.76 μm Acquisition Range: 0.5-150 μm
	Particle size distribution, (by volume)	100% < 110 μm median diameter**: 14.3, 16.8 μm Acquisition range: 0.5-150 μm
	Hydraulic conductivity (permeability)	4.0×10^{-7} cm/s
	Total porosity	67.9%
	Thermal conductivity	1.82 W/m•K @ 39 °C 2.16 W/m•K @ 56 °C 2.82 W/m•K @ 68 °C 2.04 W/m•K @ 72 °C*

*Jeppson and Wong (1993) noted an anomalous data point, but were unable to explain the inconsistency of the observation.

**Two separate measurements.

2.3.3 Chemical Composition (see Jeppson and Wong 1993)



Table 2-4. Estimated Composition of Homogenized, Centrifuged, Ferrocyanide Sludge Simulant.


Sludge component	Average In Farm 2 weight fraction
Disodium mononickel ferrocyanide: $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$	0.101
Sodium nitrate: NaNO_3	0.174
Sodium nitrite: NaNO_2	0.051
Sodium hydrogen phosphate: Na_2HPO_4	0.016
Sodium sulfate: Na_2SO_4	0.015
Calcium phosphate: $\text{Ca}_3(\text{PO}_4)_2$	0.073
Water	0.51
Percent mass balance subtotal	94.0
Percent unknown--likely includes $\text{Fe}_4(\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6)_3$, $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_3$, $\text{Ni}(\text{OH})_2$, and other materials from trace impurities	6.0

2.3.4 Energetics Behavior of Ferrocyanide Sludge Simulant

Available chemical process information indicates that there were three significantly different types of ferrocyanide waste (Sloat 1954; Schmidt and Stedwell 1954). Nonradioactive waste simulants have been developed and tested using this information. In Farm ferrocyanide waste, accounting for 20 to 25 percent of the total ferrocyanide waste, was formed from treating waste that was already stored in the tanks. The waste in tank 241-C-112 was produced using the In Farm process. Most of this waste had less inert solids in the waste stream; therefore, it is believed to have been more concentrated in ferrocyanide than other ferrocyanide wastes. In Farm simulants exhibit propagating exothermic activity when examined by differential and adiabatic scanning calorimetry (DSC and ASC).

Estimates of tank waste reactivity, which were developed after the ferrocyanide USQ was declared, were based on thermodynamic estimates (Colby and Crippen 1991). Several chemical reaction pathways were evaluated and heats of reaction were determined for each possible reaction from the published heats of formation of the reactants and the products. For the purpose of developing these estimates, the condition of the reactants are dry solid reagents at standard temperature and pressure in a stoichiometric ratio. The theoretical heats of reaction ranged in value from $\Delta H = -9.6$ kJ/g to $\Delta H = +19.7$ kJ/g of $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$, and are listed below with their corresponding chemical reactions.





At temperatures below 1700 °C (3100 °F), the carbonate product is thermodynamically favorable and should predominate (Scheele et al. 1991). Note that considerably lower energy releases are obtained if the reaction is incomplete or if NO or NO₂ is formed rather than N₂ or N₂O. A three-component diagram illustrating the exothermic potential of various mixtures of ferrocyanide, nitrate, and inerts is presented in Figure 2-4. Further detail regarding the thermodynamic estimates of these mixtures is presented in Colby and Crippen (1991).

The waste simulants prepared using the In Farm and U Plant process flowsheets were tested for chemical activity (Fauste 1992). Chemical and physical analyses of the In Farm and U Plant waste simulants show that they contain an average of 51 and 66 wt% water, respectively, after centrifugation. The centrifugation was done to represent 30 gravity-years of compaction that may have occurred during storage. This amount of water in the waste matrix presents a tremendous heat sink that must be overcome before any reactions can become self-sustaining. During the DSC examinations, the samples exhibited large endotherms between room temperature and 150 °C (Jeppson and Wong 1993). Results from thermogravimetric analyses being run at the same time showed a large loss of mass (i.e., evaporation of water) in this same temperature range; thus, reactions were only able to occur in dry or nearly dry sample material. Average ferrocyanide content of the In Farm 2 waste simulants is approximately 10.1 wet wt% (20.6 wt% dry). Table 2-5 presents the ΔH found for some simulant materials.

Table 2-5. Heats of Reaction of Various Simulants.

Material	ΔH (From Adiabatic Calorimetry)	Wt% Ferrocyanide (dry) [$\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$]	Calculated ΔH per gram $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
U Plant 1 simulant	-0.17 kJ/g of dry material	4.3	-3.95 kJ/g
U Plant 2 simulant (Bottom fraction)	-0.34 kJ/g of dry material	8.6	-3.95 kJ/g
In Farm 1 simulant (Bottom Fraction)	-1.20 kJ/g of dry material	25.5	-4.71 kJ/g


The onset temperatures for propagating reactions to take place in the simulants range from 244 °C to 278 °C (471 to 532 °F). However, Arrhenius-type reactions may occur at lower temperatures (Fauske 1992).

NOTE: 4.18 J = 1 cal.

Figure 2-4. Ferrocyanide Tank 3-Component Diagram.

FERROCYANIDE TANK 3-COMPONENT DIAGRAM

REACTION PROPAGATION VS. CONCENTRATION



Westinghouse
Hamford Company
39108002.2

3.0 CORE SAMPLING

3.1 DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLING EVENT

Tank 241-C-112 was push-mode core sampled through three risers from March 19, 1992, to March 26, 1992. Two segments were expected from each core sample. Core 34 was obtained from riser #2; Core 35 was obtained from riser #7; Core 36 was obtained from riser #8. The core samples from tank 241-C-112 were obtained using a specially designed core sampling truck (CST). The sampling equipment is mounted on a rotating platform on the CST. Access to the interior of the tank is provided by various tank risers. These risers are pipes of various diameters leading into the tank dome from the ground. The riser configuration for tank 241-C-112 is given in Figure 3-1. A review of the tank farm operating records and a field inspection of the tank risers determine which risers can be used in the sampling operation. A riser is opened and the CST is positioned over the riser. The sampler is lowered into the tank through the drill string and pushed into the waste.


The sampler is constructed of stainless steel and is 48 cm (19 in.) long, with a 2.2-cm (7/8-in.) inside diameter, and has a volume of 187 mL (0.05 gal). Tank Farm Operations has determined that sampling events of one or two segments do not require hydrostatic head balance fluid. Therefore, none was used in this operation, which eliminated any potential problems with sample contamination. When a segment is captured by the sampler, it is sealed within a stainless steel liner, and the liner is placed within a shipping cask. The shipping casks are approximately 122 cm tall, 13 cm in diameter, and have 2.5 cm of lead shielding. This degree of shielding and containment protects workers from excessive radiological exposure and prevents any liquids from the sample (or the sample itself) from being lost.

The casks were transported to the 324 Shielded Materials Facility for gamma scanning, and then to the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory for characterization analysis. Both facilities are operated by Battelle-Pacific Northwest Laboratory in the 300 Area of the Hanford Site. Cores 34 and 35 arrived at the 324 Facility on March 25, 1992, and Core 36 arrived on March 26, 1992.

3.2 CHAIN OF CUSTODY

A chain-of-custody record was kept during the sampling event for each segment that was sampled. The chain-of-custody form is a one-page record that is used to ensure that (1) the sample is safely and properly transported from the field to the laboratory, and (2) the correct personnel are involved in the sampling operation and transportation of the sample to the laboratory. Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 summarize the most important data contained in the field chain of custody.

Figure 3-1. Tank 241-C-112 Riser Configuration.



Tank 241-C-112 was constructed in 1943-1944;
It has a diameter of 22.9 m (75 feet) and nominal capacity of
2 million liters (530,000 gallons).

29304019.6

Table 3-1. Core 34--Chain-of-Custody Summary.

Sample	Core 34: 92-001	Core 34: 92-002
Place Taken	241-C-112 Riser 2	241-C-112 Riser 2
Date Taken	3/19/92	3/19/92
Date Released	3/25/92	3/25/92
Time Released	19:10	19:10
Sender	D. C. Hartley	D. C. Hartley
Receiver	M. R. Zumhoff	M. R. Zumhoff
Place Received	327 Building	327 Building
Time Received	20:55	20:55
Smearable Contamination	< DL alpha < DL beta-gamma	< DL alpha < DL beta-gamma
Dose Rate Through the Drill String	150 mR/hr	2 R/hr

Table 3-2. Core 35--Chain-of-Custody Summary.

Sample	Core 35: 92-003	Core 35: 92-004
Place Taken	241-C-112 Riser 7	241-C-112 Riser 7
Date Taken	3/22/92	3/22/92
Date Released	3/25/92	3/25/92
Time Released	19:10	19:05
Sender	D. C. Hartley	D. C. Hartley
Receiver	M. R. Zumhoff	M. R. Zumhoff
Place Received	327 Building	327 Building
Time Received	20:55	20:55
Smearable Contamination	< DL alpha < DL beta-gamma	< DL alpha < DL beta-gamma
Dose Rate Through the Drill String	1 mR/hr	500 mR/hr

Table 3-3. Core 36--Chain-of-Custody Summary.

Sample	Core 36: 92-005	Core 36: 92-006
Place Taken	241-C-112 Riser 8	241-C-112 Riser 8
Date Taken	3/24/92	3/24/92
Date Released	3/26/92	3/26/92
Time Released	19:05	19:05
Sender	D. C. Hartley	D. C. Hartley
Receiver	M. R. Zumhoff	M. R. Zumhoff
Place Received	327 Building	327 Building
Time Received	20:55	20:55
Smearable Contamination	< DL alpha < DL beta-gamma	< DL alpha < DL beta-gamma
Dose Rate Through the Drill String	2 R/hr	2 R/hr

A primary function of the chain-of-custody record is to provide radiation survey data. This is a record of the radiation dose that is emitted from the shipping cask. The dose rates in mrem/hour are measured from the top, sides, and bottom of the cask. These values are recorded on the chain of custody and represent the radiation being emitted directly from the sample. The last item recorded under the radiation survey data is the smearable contamination. Smearable contamination represents the radiation from waste material that is not sealed within the shipping cask; values greater than 100 mrem/hour are considered unsafe. Measurements are made both in the field and in the laboratory. No smearable contamination was found with these samples.

The chain of custody has several other important functions: (1) to provide a brief description of the cask, sampler, and the expected contents of the sampler (shipment, sample, and cask serial numbers for the specific sampling event); (2) to provide summary information about the analytical suite that the sample will undergo or reference the salient documentation; (3) to provide traceability for the sample during transport; and (4) to ensure sample integrity on arrival at the laboratory. This information is provided to ensure that each sample can be uniquely identified.

Copies of the chain-of-custody forms are on file at the Hanford Analytical Services Management (HASM) office. From inspection of the chain-of-custody records, there appear to be no irregularities in the sampling or transport of tank 241-C-112 samples from the field that would merit a safety or sample integrity concern (i.e., sample containment was not breached).

4.0 SAMPLE PREPARATION/SAMPLE EXTRUSION

4.1 DESCRIPTION OF GAMMA SCANNING EFFORT

The 324 Shielded Materials Facility has a device that was used for radionuclide measurements of irradiated fuel rods for the Fast Flux Test Facility program. The fuel pin reader was idle and there was the belief that this effort could be an efficient and innovative utilization of available resources in the Tank Waste Characterization/Waste Tank Safety Programs. Cores 34, 35, and 36 were transferred to the Shielded Materials Facility, and gamma scanning was performed on tank 241-C-112 sample segments using this device. Nine isotopes were scanned for: ^{137}Cs , ^{155}Eu , ^{154}Eu , ^{241}Am , ^{144}Ce , ^{134}Cs , ^{60}Co , ^{106}Ru , and ^{153}Gd . Of these, only the ^{137}Cs isotope had sufficient activity to be considered valid. The gamma scanning effort was undertaken as a means to obtain core sample information prior to extrusion. The data presented in Figures 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3 have been smoothed in a 5-point rolling average, to eliminate any anomalous peaks and to aid in interpretation of the scan.

4.1.1 Core 34

Core 34 was scanned in 2.5-mm (0.1-in.) increments at 500 seconds per increment on April 4, 1992. The scan was performed with the core in a vertical orientation, and the scan was begun at an axial location below the bottom of the segments (refer to Figure 4-1). Peak count rates for ^{137}Cs in Core 34 were 2.72 counts/sec (1,361 counts in 500 seconds). Sample lengths were estimated from the activity signatures to be 8.6 cm (3.4 in.) for segment 92-001 and 36.3 cm (14.3 in.) for segment 92-002. These sample lengths were determined to be relatively reliable for the sample solids upon extrusion. However, there remained considerable uncertainty regarding sample recovery until the samples were extruded. In the case of segment 92-001, it appeared that suspended solids were concentrated at the bottom of the sampler while it was being scanned; thus, their activity signature masked the amount of cohesive solids in the sampler. After filtering, the liquids were found to have very little activity associated with them.

4.1.2 Core 35

The scanning effort for Core 35 was subject to multiple mechanical difficulties. An anomalous peak was detected initially in the first scan on May 8, 1992. This result was suspicious and a rescan was recommended to confirm the result. The second scan performed on May 15 to verify this finding showed an abnormally low count rate (differing by an order of magnitude with Core 34). The peak from the first scan was attributed to a power surge and shutdown of the device; the low count rate from the second scan was determined to be a calibration error. A third scan was performed on May 22 with no problems (refer to Figure 4-2). Core 35 was scanned the first two times in 2.5-mm (0.1-in.) increments at 500 seconds per increment; the third scan was done at a resolution of 1.27 mm (0.05 in.) and 500 seconds per increment. The scan was performed with the core in a vertical orientation, and the scan was begun at an axial location below the bottom of the segments.

Figure 4-1. 241-C-112 Gamma Scanning, Core 34 Results.





Figure 4-2. 241-C-112 Gamma Scanning, Core 35 Results.



The sample valve was found open on segment 92-003 and the sampler was presumed empty; however, the sampler was scanned to determine if there was any contamination from contact with the tank contents. The gamma scanning measurements indicated no activity, and the sampler was empty upon extrusion. Peak count rates for ^{137}Cs in Core 35, segment 92-004 was 2.83 counts/second (1,415 counts in 500 seconds; comparable with Core 34). Sample length was estimated to be 10.2 cm (4 in.) for segment 92-004. Sample length on extrusion was found to be approximately 7.6 cm (3 in.) and, as with Core 34, the liquids found had almost no activity.

4.1.3 Core 36


Core 36 was scanned in a slightly different manner than the other two. It was scanned in 2.5-mm increments and 1,275 seconds per increment on April 16, 1992 (refer to Figure 4-3). This was done to determine if the longer viewing time improved the detection and resolution of the radioisotopes. There was no noticeable improvement in the sensitivity of the device using the longer counting times. Peak count rates for ^{137}Cs in Core 36 were 6.61 counts per second (8,430 counts in 1,275 seconds). This core sample had a much higher overall activity than the other two, better sample recovery, and a much more distinctive signature. Sample lengths were estimated to be 22.9 cm (9 in.) for segment 92-005 and 47 cm (18.5 in.) for segment 92-006. Sample length on extrusion was found to be approximately 21.8 cm (8.6 in.) and 43.9 cm (17.3 in.), respectively. There were no liquids found with these segments.

4.1.4 Tank 241-C-112 Gamma Scanning Summary

Gamma scans were performed as a scoping procedure on Cores 34, 35, and 36 to obtain a qualitative measurement of the activity of the waste and to identify the major contributors. The gamma activity pattern obtained from the scans indicated some gross layering of the waste in the tank (i.e., differences in waste types) as well as differences in activity between individual batches. Of the nine isotopes scanned for, no significant gamma emitters were found in the tank waste except ^{137}Cs , although the sample had a relatively high gamma background. The activity of tank 241-C-112 waste material ranged between 0.15 and 2 R/hour, as measured through the drill string. No significant radiological activity was found in the drainable liquid in the tank. The ^{137}Cs appeared to be almost entirely associated with the solids, and thus was assumed not soluble.

Each of the three cores in tank 241-C-112 was expected to contain one full segment and a partial (3/4) second segment. This expectation was based on calculations based on the inventory values given in Hanlon (1992). Results from the gamma scans indicated there was less than anticipated recovery. At that time, alteration of the analysis plan was necessary because there was not enough sample to perform all of the requested analyses.

Figure 4-3. 241-C-112 Gamma Scanning, Core 36 Results.




4.2 DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE HANDLING AND ANALYTICAL SCHEME

4.2.1 Sample Breakdown Procedure

Because tank 241-C-112 has been identified as a Watch List tank, as detailed in Section 2.1.2, more extensive analytical measurements are required to resolve the safety concerns associated with this tank. To enhance the resolution of the assays for key analytes, the analysis horizon for characterization was determined to be one-quarter of a segment.

The sampler was removed from the shipping cask directly into the hot cell. At this time, the sampler must be placed into the horizontal position; hence, any free liquid at the top of the sampler has an opportunity to drain to the liner. The sample was then loaded into the mechanical extruder and removed by pushing it out from the back of the sampler with a piston. In this case, the sampler is pressed against a fixed piston, forcing the sample into the extrusion tray. If a full sample has been captured, the material nearest the valve was from a deeper part of the tank; the material near the piston was closer to the surface. The sample and any liquids were collected on a metal tray. Next, the mass of the segment and the approximate length were recorded. From this information, the bulk densities of the segments can be estimated. The sample volume is determined by measuring the length of the extruded sample using a linear unit volume of 9.85 mL/in. Each segment was divided into 12-cm ($4\frac{1}{2}$ -in.) subsegments. Figure 4-4 illustrates how the ferrocyanide SST segment sample was extruded and divided into subsegments. A video record of the extrusions of each of the segments from tank 241-C-112 was made, and color photographs documenting the extruded segments were taken.

Figure 4-4. Typical Single-Shell Tank Segment Extrusion.



Several different styles of nomenclature are used for distinguishing core samples, sample segments, and subsegments in the existing literature. Two major conventions are used in the documentation relating to ferrocyanide (and core sampling in general). The first is designating the segment with the last two digits of the calendar year (92-) and then numbering the segments sequentially (-001, -002, etc.). This system resets itself every calendar year. The second system distinguishes the tank, core, segment, and subsegment. The first (bottom) 12 cm ($4\frac{1}{2}$ in.) of the extruded sample is assigned to the fourth subsegment and is uniquely identified (Tank ID - Core No. - Segment No. - D). The following three 12-cm ($4\frac{1}{2}$ -in.) sections of the

extruded segment are labelled as C, B, and A, respectively. An example of this naming protocol for the third subsegment from the second segment of the first core is (241-C-112-Core 34-Segment 2-B). If the extruded segment is less than 48 cm (19 in.) long, then the same naming convention applies until no solid material is left to make a complete 12-cm (4½-in.) subsegment. The first 12 cm (4½ in.) is be assigned to the D subsegment (etc.). This second system of naming is the primary convention used in this report. Where no tank identification is given in this report, it should be understood as meaning tank 241-C-112.

4.2.2 Homogenization Tests

The subsegment and core composite samples are homogenized using a mechanical mixer prior to analysis. This is done so that aliquots removed for analysis will be representative of the entire subsegment or core composite. Aliquots of the homogenized tank waste from Core 34-2C and 2D, Core 35-2D, and Core 36-1C and 2D were taken to determine the efficacy of the homogenization procedure. The samples were split into duplicates, acid digested, and assayed by inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP) and gamma energy analysis. This procedure is done to determine if the degree of mixing achieved by the as-planned homogenization procedure was sufficient for the remaining samples to be homogenized and prepared for analysis. If the analytes from the aliquots are within a relative percent difference (RPD) of 10 percent, the samples are considered homogenized. If there are several analytes that are not within the specified RPD, the samples are mixed further and re-assayed. Once homogenization was indicated, the remaining samples were homogenized via the required procedure and prepared for analysis. The investigators reported that the samples from tank 241-C-112 exhibited substantial resistance to homogenization. Generally, the samples had to be blended twice before the ICP results were considered satisfactory. The gamma energy analysis never showed satisfactory homogenization; it indicated the distribution of radionuclides remained irregular even after the second homogenization. However, this behavior was not unexpected because the simulant materials were very resistant to dissolution. The acid digestion preparation was probably insufficient to completely dissolve the sample, and the ¹³⁷Cs was associated with the insoluble materials. In the future, homogenization tests of suspected ferrocyanide tanks should use a potassium hydroxide (KOH) fusion sample preparation procedure because it provides more complete dissolution of the sample.

4.2.3 Subsegment-Level Analyses

The objectives of subsegment-level analyses are to provide (1) information as a function of depth pertaining to the overall waste energetics, (2) the distribution of ¹³⁷Cs and ⁹⁰Sr, (3) the concentration and solubility of the CN⁻ present in the sample, and (4) a higher resolution for determining bulk tank composition for certain analytes. To accomplish these goals, the limited suite of analyses listed in Table 4-1 was performed on each homogenized subsegment. These analyses were conducted using the analytical procedures identified in Tables I5-1 and I5-2 of WHC-EP-0210, Rev 3 (Hill et al. 1991), and as amended in Hill (1991). Brief descriptions of the sample preparation and assay methods are presented.

Table 4-1. Subsegment-Level Analysis.

Direct	Fusion Dissolution	Water Leach
TOC/TIC TGA DSC Total CN ⁻ Wt% H ₂ O	ICP (Metals) GEA (¹³⁷ Cs) ⁹⁰ Sr	IC (Anions) CN ⁻ pH GEA

DSC = Differential scanning calorimetry.

GEA = Gamma energy analysis.

ICP = Inductively coupled plasma - atomic emission spectroscopy.

TGA = Thermogravimetric analysis.

TIC = Total inorganic carbon.

TOC = Total organic carbon.

Direct analyses are assays performed on the sample matrix with little or no sample preparation. Several direct analyses were performed relating to the energetic properties of the waste: total organic carbon (TOC), scanning thermogravimetric analysis (TGA), DSC, total cyanide, and gravimetric weight percent water.

The TOC was determined using the hot persulfate method. That method dissolves a sample in a sulfuric acid solution (90 °C+) to liberate inorganic carbon (carbonate). Potassium persulfate (K₂S₂O₈) is then added, and organic carbon is converted to CO₂, which is measured coulometrically. The difficulty encountered in solubilizing the sample matrix in the homogenization tests makes the results of this assay potentially unreliable.

Scanning TGA and DSC are useful in determining the thermal stability or reactivity of a material. TGA measures the mass of a sample while the temperature of the sample is increased at a constant rate. In DSC analysis, the heat absorbed/evolved over and above the usual heat capacity of the substance is measured while the substance is exposed to a linear increase in temperature.

Total cyanide analysis was done using a developmental procedure developed at Pacific Northwest Laboratory (PNL). The sample was dissolved in a solution of ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid and ethylenediamine and placed in a microdistillation apparatus. The total cyanide content was determined by argentometric titration.

The gravimetric weight percent water was determined by drying the sample for 12 to 24 hours in an oven at 103 to 105 °C and measuring the difference in the weight of the sample.

Analyses that were performed on fusion-prepared samples were ICP and gamma energy analyses (GEA) for radionuclides. Fusion dissolution analyses are assays performed on the sample matrix after it has been fused with potassium hydroxide in a nickel crucible and dissolved in acid. This preparation dissolves the entire sample, whereas other sample preparation

procedures may not completely dissolve the sample matrix. However, one significant disadvantage of fusion preparation is that large amounts of potassium hydroxide are required to bring a sample into solution. Because of this high dilution factor, trace elements are less likely to be correctly quantified, if they are detected at all. Elements that occur in abundance (major metals) or are highly insoluble are likely to be detected better by the fusion results than by any other sample preparation. Generally, fusion dissolution is the preferred method of analyzing radionuclide content, with the exception of ^{14}C and ^3H (tritium). However, the sample preparation specified in the test instructions for ^{14}C (water digestion) is likely not the best for the ferrocyanide waste. Difficulty with dissolving the sample with a water leach, and volatility associated with a fusion preparation, will bias the ^{14}C results low for both sample preparations. An adequate sample preparation method for ^{14}C is not available for this sample matrix; however, ^{14}C is not expected to be a significant contributor to the radionuclide content of the waste.

Water leach (or water digestion) analyses are assays performed after the sample matrix has been digested in distilled/deionized water; the water is then analyzed for soluble analytes. The soluble anions are determined by ion chromatography (IC). The primary anions analyzed in this manner are fluoride, chloride, nitrate, nitrite, phosphate, and sulfate. In addition, free cyanide and pH were also analyzed from water digestion samples.

4.2.4 Rheological and Physical Measurements

Only one 25-mL aliquot (from the second segment of Core 36) was used for rheological and physical measurements. Viscosity, settling properties, fluid behavior, and shear strength were some of the primary characteristics investigated. The sample tested for these properties was not homogenized prior to analysis.

4.2.5 Subsegment Level Archive

Several analyses (adiabatic calorimetry, ferrocyanide speciation, and total oxygen demand [TOD]) have been identified by the Waste Tank Safety Programs as requiring developmental work. A sufficient amount of sample from each subsegment has been archived to perform these analyses when the procedures for these analyses have been developed. The adiabatic calorimetry assay will be performed on each subsegment if an exotherm of predetermined parameters is detected by DSC analysis. The boundaries for performing adiabatic calorimetry have been determined to be when the DSC exotherm is greater than -75 cal/g and the sample has 15 wt% water or less; or when the exotherm is greater than -125 cal/g , even if the sample has greater than 15 wt% water. Because of sample consumption constraints, the TOD test cannot be run for the subsegment from the rheology segment.

4.2.6 Core Composite Level Analysis

One composite from each core was built and analyzed in accordance with the complete baseline case core composite scenario detailed in Section 6.1 of WHC-EP-0210 (Hill et al. 1991) and as amended by Hill (1991). The type and number of analytical tests performed are similar to the suite done on the subsegments, but are much more extensive. The free liquid from the segments in Core 34 was combined and analyzed as a separate liquid core composite. The free liquid from the segment in Core 35 was also analyzed as a liquid core composite.

Selected radionuclides were measured on some of the water digestion samples to determine the type and number of water soluble radionuclides. ICP and atomic absorption (AA) spectroscopy were also performed on some of the water digestion samples. These assays were performed to determine the amount of soluble metal cations (ICP) or arsenic, mercury, or selenium (AA). In most cases, these analytes were below the detection limits in the water digestion samples, suggesting that most of the analytes are not water soluble.

Acid digestion is a preparation method where the sample is dissolved in a mixture of nitric and hydrochloric acids. This preparation brings most of the insoluble metals into a solution with a minimum amount of dilution, and is usually best for detecting trace and some major metals. These properties are the reason that acid digestion is generally used as the sample preparation for the homogenization tests. The analyses performed on this preparation were the ICP, GEA, and AA analysis (the AA analysis used nitric acid only). IC analysis was not performed with the acid digestion preparation solution.

Major metals that were well quantified with fusion ICP analysis for tank 241-C-112 were aluminum, calcium, iron, sodium, and uranium; phosphorous is a non-metallic analyte detected by the ICP. In the case of these elements, the fusion result is the preferred value to repeat. Although the assay was performed in a nickel crucible, nickel values from the fusion preparation will be reported because they are important to interpreting the overall results. This is done with the understanding that they may be biased high. A zirconium crucible was initially recommended for use with these assays to eliminate any potential nickel bias, but the sample matrix reacted with the zirconium during the fusion procedure. However, potassium readings from the ICP fusion are not reported because potassium hydroxide was used to dissolve the sample and the potassium results are not important to characterizing the waste. Some of the primary radionuclides that are measured using this sample preparation are neptunium, plutonium, strontium, cesium, and technetium. A total alpha and total beta count were performed on the fusion dissolution samples as well.

A U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Contract Laboratory Procedure (CLP) type organics speciation analysis was performed on the core composites. No CLP target compounds or tentatively identified compounds were detected in levels above accepted quantitation limits (HASM 1993), and they were not expected to contribute to the sample matrix.

In previous characterization sampling, the core composites were built using quantities of segments based on a proportion of the total weight of sample for the core (Winters et al. 1990a,b). This method assumed that the sample obtained is representative of what is in the tank. However, when

partially filled segments are obtained, this procedure assumes that the tank does not contain any waste in this area. Incomplete recovery for a segment is more likely the result of sampling problems rather than voids in the waste.

The approach used in this analysis effort was to composite equal quantities of the homogenized subsegment material and assume that whatever is obtained in a partial subsegment is representative of a whole subsegment. Some inaccuracies may be introduced from this method because of density differences between subsegments. However, the inaccuracies introduced from density differences would probably be small; those deviations are minimal compared to the other errors inherent in core sampling and analysis. If full segments are obtained for the entire core, and the homogenization procedure is satisfactory, there will be little difference between the two approaches.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.0 ANALYTICAL RESULTS: TANK 241-C-112

5.1 TANK 241-C-112 CORE SAMPLE RECOVERY

As shown in Figure 5-1, the last 3.8 cm (1.5 in.) of the 48.3-cm (19-in.) sampler does not secure a sample from the bottom segment. In addition, the location of the risers, the dished bottom of the tank, and safety margins in the sampling protocol preclude obtaining samples from the entire waste depth in the tank. Thus, the maximum recovery for the top segment from tank 241-C-112 is 3.8 cm (1.5 in.) above the bit bottom to the waste surface. The next segment will likewise not obtain the lowest 3.8 cm (1.5 in.), but should include the 3.8 cm (1.5 in.) from the *N-1* segment for a full 48.3-cm (19-in.) segment. Segment recoveries were based on the maximum recoverable volume for the segment, regardless of solid/liquid ratio. In the upper segments of tank 241-C-112 (92-001, -003, and -005), the maximum recoverable amount of waste is 33.8 cm (13.3 in.) (131 mL) and 48.3 cm (19 in.) (187 mL) for the lower segments (92-002, -004, and -006). Tables 5-1 and 5-2 present the initial measurements and observations regarding the core samples on extrusion, and an estimate of the core recovery on a volume basis.

Table 5-1. Tank 241-C-112 Core Sample Description Summary.

Core No.	Segment	Core Recovery (Vol. basis)	Total Mass g	Comments
Core 34 Upper	92-001	87.0%	136.9	Liquid contained suspended solids. Solids portion was 1.3 cm (0.5 in.) long.
Core 34 Lower	92-002	74.9%	211.8	Grey/white streak at edge of solids. Solid segment was 36.1 cm (14.2 in.) long.
Core 35 Upper	92-003	0%	N/A	No sample recovered; valve remained open.
Core 35 Lower	92-004	34.8%	109.1	Liquid contained suspended solids. Solid segment was 7.6 cm (3 in.) long.
Core 36 Upper	92-005	64.9%	105.8	Medium brown color; no drainable liquid. Solid segment was 21.8 cm (8.6 in.) long.
Core 36 Lower	92-006	90.9%	263.7	Thin brown sludge at bottom of segment with the material gaining consistency and gradually changing color to grey/white moving up the core. Solid segment was 43.9 cm (17.3 in.) long.

Figure 5-1. Current Condition of Tank 241-C-112.





Table 5-2. Tank 241-C-112 Core Sample Physical Characteristics Summary.

Core No.	Segment	Solids Sample Mass (g)	Liquid Sample Mass (g)	Solids Sample Volume (mL)	Liquid Sample Volume (mL)	Solids Bulk Density (g/mL)	Liquids Bulk Density (g/mL)
Core 34	92-001	20.99	115.89	14	100	1.5	1.2
Core 34	92-002	175.75	36.07	110	30	1.6	1.2
Core 35	92-003	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A
Core 35	92-004	58.7	50.35	30	35	2.0	1.4
Core 36	92-005	105.8	0.0	85	0	1.2	None
Core 36	92-006	263.7	0.0	170	0	1.6	None

Solids: wet solids
Liquid: drainable (free) liquid

General characteristics of tank 241-C-112 waste materials are as follows.

- Drainable liquids were all rust to dark brown in color and contained significant amounts of suspended solids. After filtering, the liquids were dark yellow.
- Core samples ranged from grey/white to tan/dark brown in color. No sharp boundaries were observed in the samples. The changes in color occurred gradually over the sample length.
- The samples also ranged in consistency from a thin slurry to a very thick, chunky sludge. They appeared to be saturated with liquid.
- The samples slumped somewhat, but held their shape relatively well (high viscosity, non-Newtonian fluids).

Summary tables of the most significant components are also provided. Analysis of the samples was performed at the PNL Analytical Chemistry Laboratory facility in the 300 Area of the Hanford Site. The full data package is available from the Hanford Analytical Services Management Office (HASM 1993).

5.2 TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM PROGRAM ELEMENT CHARACTERIZATION SYNOPSIS

This section provides selected results obtained from core sampling for some of the most pertinent analytes for the various Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) program elements, including Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant (HWVP), Retrieval, Pretreatment, and Waste Tank Safety. Analytes of interest will be reported on a level of resolution commensurate with the available data and program direction. Watch List tanks will have segment or subsegment level analyses reported, while non-Watch List tanks are analyzed only on a core composite basis. Generally, analytes of interest to multiple programs will only be reported in one section. Further detail can be found in the body of the report or in the data packages.

5.2.1 Retrieval Program Characterization Data Summary

A major objective of the Characterization program is to measure the physical properties of the waste to support waste retrieval technology development. The physical characteristics of tank waste are required to develop design criteria for waste retrieval equipment, to provide a basis for simulated waste development, and to provide a basis for validation of equipment testing using design criteria and simulated waste. The analytical methods to determine the physical properties of the waste as it actually exists in the tank require a substantial amount (50 to 100 g) of unhomogenized sample. In some cases, the limited amount of sample recovered constrains the number of analyses that can be performed.

Performing the rheological/physical measurements once for each stratum of waste in a tank is believed to be sufficient to characterize the entire tank contents. Selected rheological and physical properties are presented in Table 5-3; further information regarding these analytes can be found in Section 5.3.

Table 5-3. Retrieval Program Data Summary.

Analyte	Data Range
Specific Gravity (g/mL)	
--solids	1.2 - 2.0
--liquids	1.2 - 1.4
Shear Strength	16,000 dynes/cm ²
Viscosity (cP @ 29 °C)	
--undiluted	160,000 - 220,000
--1:1 dilution	50 (high shear) - 400 (low shear)
--3:1 dilution	~2
Particle Size (μm)	
--Number distribution	97% < 2 μm
--Volume distribution	100% < 85 μm

5.2.2 Pretreatment Program Characterization Summary

The majority of the programmatic decisions pertaining to the design of pretreatment and final disposal systems will be based upon the average characteristics of the tank waste. Therefore, the majority of the laboratory analyses will be conducted on representative core composites. Liquid composites and strata composites will be built under some circumstances, and will be analyzed with fewer assays. As noted previously, segment (and subsegment) analyses will be performed, when directed.

Trace chemical analytes of interest are presented in Table 5-4. This table indicates selected, minor analytes of known interest; further chemical (and radiological) characterization information on primary analytes can be

found in Sections 5.4 to 5.6. At this time, there are analytes for which methods are in development, or being phased in as part of a technology transfer effort. In these cases, samples will be archived until the requisite method has been developed and implemented, or samples will be shipped between the onsite laboratories (222-S and 325) and possibly even to offsite laboratories for analysis.

Table 5-4. Pretreatment Program Data Summary.

Analyte	Core Composite Values		
Minor ICP Analytes ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 34	Core 35	Core 36
--B	100	110	140
--Cr	240	210	220
--Mg	430	780	540
--Si	1500	2500	843
--Zr	20	10	30
pH (Drainable liquid)	10.30	10.47	N.M.
pH (Water leach)	10.33	9.77	9.2

N.M. = No measurement.

5.2.3 Waste Tank Safety Program Characterization Data Summary

5.2.3.1 Criticality Safety. The criticality safety program has indicated that plutonium and uranium isotopic analyses on each core composite and the bottom most 15.2 cm (6 in.) of each core is required to alleviate the concern for the potential of tank criticality. For the ferrocyanide tanks, the analyses are performed on the bottom subsegment. As requested, the analyses will indicate whether the fissile species have settled in a concentrated layer at the bottom of a tank. Therefore, upon extruding the last segment in a core, the waste to be tested shall be homogenized before a small aliquot is taken and analyzed for plutonium and uranium isotopic analyses by mass spectroscopy (MS) prior to homogenization. Tables 5-5 and 5-6 present the results of these analyses for plutonium and some transuranics; uranium results can be found in Table 5-28.

Table 5-5. Core Composite Transuranics (fusion preparation).

Core No.	^{237}Np ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{238}Pu ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$ ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	$^{241}\text{Am}_{\text{GEA}}$ ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	$^{241}\text{Am}_{\text{AEA}}$ ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	Total α ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)
Core 34	6.62E-04	0.0137	0.155	0.76	0.613	0.95
Core 35	1.20E-03	0.0137	0.151	1.05	0.763	1.18
Core 36	4.09E-04	0.0033	0.0593	ND	0.0612	0.17

AEA = Measurement by alpha energy analysis.

GEA = Measurement by gamma energy analysis.

ND = Not detected.

Table 5-6. Plutonium Isotopic Distribution.

Core No.	²³⁸ Pu mass fraction	²³⁹ Pu mass fraction	²⁴⁰ Pu mass fraction	²⁴¹ Pu mass fraction	²⁴² Pu mass fraction
Core 34	0.00037	0.93885	0.05846	0.00153	0.00077
Core 35	N.M.	N.M.	N.M.	N.M.	N.M.
Core 36	0.00023	0.95887	0.03943	0.00103	0.00046









N.M. = Plutonium isotopic distribution not measured, plutonium concentration too low for mass spectroscopy analysis.

5.2.3.2 Ferrocyanide Tanks. During the 1950's, ferrocyanide compounds were used to scavenge ¹³⁷Cs from the supernate of Hanford Site waste tanks. The potential for an exothermic reaction in the cesium-nickel ferrocyanide/sodium nitrate complex must be evaluated in waste tanks believed to contain 1,000 gram-moles or more of ferrocyanide precipitates. The characterization objectives in support of resolution of this unreviewed safety question (USQ) and in support of retrieval, pretreatment, and final disposal systems design are as follows.

- Determine the waste energetics behavior in the tanks.
- Determine the spatial distribution of fuel, ¹³⁷Cs and ⁹⁰Sr.
- Determine the concentration of total CN⁻ and the speciation of ferrocyanide present in the waste.
- Satisfy the general characterization requirements for physical, chemical, and radiological analytes.

To achieve the above objectives and to enhance the resolution of the vertical distribution study for key analytes, the analysis horizon for characterization of layering is one-quarter of a segment. The data from tank 241-C-112 indicate that the tank meets the present criterion for placement on the Ferrocyanide Watch List (i.e., greater than 1,000 g-mol ferrocyanide, estimated from total cyanide measurements). Figures 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4 depict the core samples and provide values for analytes of importance to the Ferrocyanide Safety Program as a function of position.

Figure 5-2. Segments 1 and 2, Core 34 Measurements and Observations.

Analytes			Analytes						
^{137}Cs $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	^{90}Sr $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$ $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	Segment 1		H_2O wt%	Total CN^- wt% (dry basis)	NO_2^- wt%	NO_3^- wt%	ΔH cal/g
240	1300	N.M.	1A		45	0.52	6.0	7.9	-5.1
			1B						
			1C						
			1D						
Segment 2									
610	4900	N.M.	2A		53	0.43	5.4	7.0	-6.7
			2B						
			2C						
800	1100	N.M.	2D		58	0.83	4.9	6.5	-6.1
510	2500	N.M.			52	0.75	4.6	6.0	-6.7
0.044	0.35	N.M.	Drainable Liquid		N.M.	0.46	5.5	7.2	N.M.
750	3500	0.155	Core Composite		38	0.97	6.2	8.0	-4.4

 Drainable Liquid

N.M. = No measurement

29304019.10

 Solids

Figure 5-3. Segments 1 and 2, Core 35 Measurements and Observations.

Analytes			Analytes						
^{137}Cs $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	^{90}Sr $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$ $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	Segment 1		H_2O wt%	Total CN^- wt% (dry basis)	NO_2^- wt%	NO_3^- wt%	ΔH cal/g
No Sample			1A						
			1B						
			1C						
			1D						
			Segment 2						
			2A						
			2B						
			2C						
			2D						
			2D						
.007	.23	N.M.	Drainable Liquid		N.M.	0.29	4.6	5.9	N.M.
700	3200	0.151	Core Composite		34	N.M.	3.5	4.4	-6.0









 Drainable Liquid

N.M. = No measurement

29304019.8

 Solids

Figure 5-4. Segments 1 and 2, Core 36 Measurements and Observations.

Analytes			Analytes						
^{137}Cs $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	^{90}Sr $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$ $\frac{\mu\text{Ci}}{\text{g}}$	Segment 1		H_2O wt%	Total CN^- wt% (dry basis)	NO_2^- wt%	NO_3^- wt%	ΔH cal/g
560	1900		1A						
			1B						
			1C		49	N.M.	4.8	6.2	-5.8
			1D		58	0.72	5.1	6.7	-8.0
			Segment 2						
880	20		2A		57	0.92	4.9	6.6	-5.2
530	70		2B		41	0.75	3.0	4.3	-3.7
100	140		2C		64	0.40	3.2	4.6	No Exotherm
40	200		2D		56	0.56	3.5	5.1	No Exotherm
800	510	0.06	Drainable Liquid Core Composite		45	0.71	5.3	7.2	-8.6

Drainable Liquid - None

N.M. = No measurement

29304019.9

 Solids

5.2.4 Hanford Waste Vittrification Plant Program Characterization Data Summary

The Hanford Waste Vittrification (HWVP) program has characterization needs in addition to those described for core sampling. Transforming waste into glass is primarily for the disposal of high-level/transuranic solids in a geologic repository. The vittrification process will be performed after the solids have been pretreated. Therefore, the core sample information will provide preliminary bounding design conditions for the glass plant. Further characterization for technology development and regulatory compliance will be necessary on the pretreated waste that will be fed to the vittrification plant. The analytical requirements for the HWVP program are identified in the *Hanford Waste Vittrification Plant Feed Characterization Requirements* Revision 4, (Wagner 1992).

Neutralized current acid waste (NCAW) is expected to be pretreated by a sludge washing process prior to becoming the first feed to HWVP. The high heat waste in tanks C-105 and C-106 will also be an early feed to HWVP and is expected to be pretreated in the same manner (one of the two cores from tank C-106 will be analyzed as an early feed tank). Other tanks, such as 241-C-112, may be considered for early retrieval and processing, based on technical and programmatic criteria. Some of the characterization objectives in support of design of retrieval, pretreatment, and final disposal systems are as follows.

- Provide extensive characterization of the chemical and radiological contents of the waste (solids and supernate) as it currently exists in the tanks to support processability assessments and to verify whether the composition variability study envelope coverage for key analytes is adequate.
- Provide sufficient data to make an estimate of the waste fraction that will remain after sludge wash pretreatment and become feed for HWVP.
- Determine the physical and rheological properties of the waste before and after simulated sludge washing to support the design of a waste retrieval system.
- Satisfy the general characterization requirements for physical, chemical, and radiological analytes.

Planned early retrieval of some tanks for HWVP necessitates an increased evaluation of rheological and physical properties of the tank waste. To this end, selected rheological and physical properties are measured on the first and last segments of both cores taken from these tanks as a minimum. Rheological measurements will also be performed on other segment material if a unique stratum is identified in the remaining segments.

The analytical program for HWVP not only entails determining whether a waste type is suitable for disposal as glass, but also includes determining the physical and chemical characteristics of the glass for process control purposes and to ensure regulatory compliance. Sampling and analysis plans will be developed on an individual basis for each tank or process batch. The

characterization needs for these efforts include analyses for metals, water-soluble anions, radionuclides, semi-volatile organics, and rheological and physical testing for both the HWVP feed and vitrified product.

Presently, tank 241-C-112 is not scheduled as an early feed to the HWVP. However, in recognition that the tank may be considered in the future as a potential early retrieval/processing candidate, two selected groups of analytes are presented in this summary. Table 5-7 provides a set of analytes of interest to the vitrification process control. Table 5-8 presents analytes of interest to the regulatory permitting of such a facility.

Table 5-7. HWVP Process Stream Analytes of Concern.

Analyte	Core 34 Composite ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 35 Composite ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 36 Composite ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
PO_4^{3-}	62,000	34,500	52,500
F^-	1,000	300	450
Cl^-	1,300	750	1,050
TOC	3,100	1,200	3,100

Table 5-8. HWVP Regulatory Operation Analytes of Concern.

Analyte	Core 34	Core 35	Core 36
Hg (D. Liquid)	3.53	1.30	4.40
Pb (D. Liquid) (Composite)	< DL 3,300	< DL 4,600	N.M. 1,050
Cr(VI) (D. Liquid)	130	93	75*
^{14}C (D. Liquid) (Composite)	0.004 N.M.	0.002 N.M.	0.002** N.M.
^{99}Tc (D. Liquid) (Composite)	0.112 0.139	0.084 0.097	N.M. 0.107
^3H (D. Liquid)	0.232	0.002	0.016*

*Water leach.

**Based on a single measurement.

5.3 TANK 241-C-112 CORE SAMPLE RHEOLOGICAL/PHYSICAL MEASUREMENTS

Physical properties such as shear strength, viscosity, particle size, and settling properties were measured. These measurements are necessary for the design and fabrication of retrieval, pretreatment, and final waste disposal systems.

5.3.1 Shear Strength

The shear strength of tank 241-C-112 Core 36 was measured on a combined, unhomogenized sample obtained from both segments of the core. The shear strength measurements were made at ambient temperature using a shear vane connected to a viscometer and rotated at 0.3 rpm. Shear strength (τ_s) is a semiquantitative measurement of the force required to move the sample. Because shear strength is dependent on sample handling, the measurement was taken without any sample homogenization. The rheology sample was generated by taking small aliquots from the bottom segment of Core 36 at various positions. The aliquots were transferred to a sample jar and allowed to settle for 10 weeks to let the sample recover from the disturbance of sampling and extrusion. The extended delay between sample and analysis was specified because it is believed that the longer the sample sits undisturbed, the more likely it is to return to its (nearly) original condition; therefore, the shear measurement is likely to be more representative. The shear stress (S_r) of the sample was recorded as a function of time and the shear strength was calculated using Equation 1.

$$\tau_s = \frac{[\% \tau / 100] * S_r * 4.9E+05}{\frac{\pi * H_v * D_v^2}{2} + \frac{\pi * D_v^3}{6}} \quad (1)$$

where

$\% \tau / 100$ = the ratio of the total torque which is recorded as full scale on the plot of the shear stress

S_r = shear stress

$4.9E+05$ = maximum torque of the viscometer head (dynes)

H_v = shear vane height (0.635 cm)

D_v = shear vane diameter (0.635 cm)

Shear strength for the sample was found to be 16,000 dynes/cm². Relative percent difference between initial and duplicate measurements of the sample was less than 1 percent.

5.3.2 Viscosity as a Function of Shear Rate

Viscosity measurements (as a function of shear rate) were performed on the composite sample and the 1:1 sample:water dilution of the sample at ambient hot cell temperatures 29 to 32 °C (84 to 90 °F) and at 95 °C (203 °F). At 95 °C the undiluted core composite sample dried too quickly to obtain an accurate viscosity measurement; therefore, no data are presented for the undiluted sample at that temperature. The rheological properties for the undiluted sample were not characteristic of any accepted behavior models. In addition, the undiluted sample behavior at high shear rates is considered

suspect. Viscosity of the undiluted sample at low shear ranged from 160,000 to 220,000 cP. The 1:1 dilution of the composite sample exhibited yield-pseudoplastic behavior. Plots of the measurements can be found in the summary data packages or in the full validated data packages (HASM 1993). Viscosities as a function of shear rate for the 1:1 dilutions ranged from 400 cP (at low shear rates) to 50 cP (at high shear rates).

Further measurements of the shear stress as a function of shear rate were made on the 1:3 sample:water dilution samples at ambient temperature and at 95 °C (203 °F). The ambient samples were run in duplicate; however, due to drying of the sample, only a single measurement could be performed at 95 °C (203 °F). All of the 1:3 diluted samples had viscosities near the detection limit of the apparatus (2 cP). The diluted samples also exhibit yield-pseudoplastic behavior. But, at viscosities near the detection limit, accurate modeling of the flow properties with this data becomes difficult. The viscosity of the sample was observed to decrease significantly as the temperature increased.

The data from the rheograms for the 1:1 dilution were fit to a nonlinear yield power-law model (Equation 2). Sample and duplicate measurements were run at ambient and 95 °C.

$$S_r = \alpha + \beta \gamma^n \quad (2)$$

where

- S_r = shear stress
- α = yield stress (not a fit parameter)
- β = consistency factor
- γ = shear rate (0 to 468 s⁻¹)
- n = flow behavior index

Table 5-9 presents the power law model parameters for the 1:1 sample dilutions at 29 and 95 °C.

Table 5-9. Power-Law Model Parameters for Tank 241-C-112 Material.

Sample	Temperature (°C)	Trial	α , Yield Stress (Pa)	β , Consistency Factor (Pa•s)	n , Flow Behavior Index
1:1 Dilution	29	S	6.8	0.279	0.576
1:1 Dilution	29	D	5.8	0.302	0.534
1:1 Dilution	95	S	3.6	0.079	0.68
1:1 Dilution	95	D	4	0.097	0.648

S = Sample
D = Duplicate.

A rheogram for a material with a yield stress has two sections. The first section is a straight line beginning at the origin and climbing up the ordinate. This portion of the rheogram records the material as it acts like a solid or gel. When sufficient force is applied to the material to make the gel yield, the rheogram breaks sharply to the right; recording the material's behavior as a fluid. The point on the rheogram at which the sample's behavior transfers from a solid or gel to a fluid is the yield point or yield stress. The consistency factor in this model is analogous to viscosity. The flow behavior index indicates the degree of deviation from Newtonian behavior. For values less than 1, the behavior is considered pseudoplastic (Bird et al. 1960).

5.3.3 Slurry Flow Properties

Turbulent flow is necessary to keep particles in suspension and prevent the accumulation of the solids in retrieval and/or pretreatment process equipment. Characteristics necessary for turbulent flow were calculated for the 1:1 dilution slurry using the parameters determined from measurement and a curve-fitted rheological model (refer to Table 5-10).

Table 5-10. Turbulent Flow Model Calculations.

Sample	Temp. (°C)	Trial	Pipe Dia. (in.)	Velocity (m/s)	Critical Flow Rate (L/min)	Reynolds Number
1:1 Dilution	29	S	2	1.9	246	4,425
1:1 Dilution	29	D	2	1.7	220	4,470
1:1 Dilution	29	S	3	1.7	496	4,920
1:1 Dilution	29	D	3	1.6	447	4,908
1:1 Dilution	95	S	2	1.3	163	5,190
1:1 Dilution	95	D	2	1.3	170	5,214
1:1 Dilution	95	S	3	1.2	329	6,002
1:1 Dilution	95	D	3	1.2	344	5,997

S = Sample

D = Duplicate.

5.3.4 Particle Size Measurement

Particle size analysis is performed by placing a small amount of sample in a dispersant (which is the liquid used to disperse and suspend the particles from the solid sample). The prepared sample was placed in a particle size analyzer. The apparatus measures particle size by passing a thin beam of laser light through the dispersant. The diameter of a particle of matter in the dispersant can be determined by the amount of light that it blocks as the particle passes through the beam. The dimension measured by this method is the value across the short diameter of the particle. This means that if a particle is oblong, the machine estimates the shortest length

across the particle (i.e., the width of the oblong shape, not the length). The term "diameter" throughout this text will be used to describe any linear profile of any shape.


An important consideration involving the analysis of particle size is the dispersant used. The primary concern involved with the dispersant is dissolving the particle. Any particles existing in the tank that are soluble in the dispersant will dissolve or decrease in size during the analysis. Depending on the dispersant, the particle size analysis may not represent the true particle size distribution in the tank. In the case of tank 241-C-112, a mixture of water and glycerin was used as the dispersing medium. If a "true" particle size distribution is required, the mother liquor (drainable liquid) of the tank should be used, if possible, because the tank particulates are already in equilibrium with the tank mother liquor. The high insolubility of the waste matrix suggests that the particle size data acquired should be acceptable. However, if the ferrocyanide waste has been hydrolyzed by high-pH waste, this assumption may not be completely accurate.

The mean particle size in the number distribution ranges from 0.83 microns to 0.95 micron in diameter for the tank core samples. Table 5-11 presents the summary results of the measurements. Plots of the distributions are presented as Figures 5-5 and 5-6. The first graph is the probability number density. The number density graph is plotted over the acquisition range of the device (from 0.5 to 150 microns). The numbers of particles in each size range (shown as a percentage of the whole) are graphed against their respective size ranges to form a distribution curve. It can be seen from Figure 5-5 that the most common occurrences (modes) for particle size range between 0.5 and 1.0 microns. The majority (over 90 percent) of the measured particles fit within the narrow band of 0.4 to 1.5 microns, and over 97 percent of the particles have a diameter of less than 2 microns.

Table 5-11. Particle Size Distribution by Number:
97% < 2 μ m (both cores).


Sample	Mean (μ m)	Median (μ m)
Core 34, subsegment 2D, Initial	0.83	0.76
Core 34, subsegment 2D, Duplicate	0.94	0.83
Core 36, 92-005 (random sample)	0.95	0.84

Figure 5-5. Core 34, Particle Size Number Density.



29304019.4

Figure 5-6. Core 36, Particle Size Number Density.



29304019.3

The particle size in the volume distribution ranges from 0.4 microns to 80 microns in diameter between the two cores. Table 5-12 presents the summary results of the measurements. Under the assumption that the density of the solid material within the tank is constant, the volume distribution is also the best estimation of the mass particle size distribution of the tank. The analyzer calculates particle volume as the cube of the diameter. These distributions are presented as Figures 5-7 and 5-8.

Table 5-12. Particle Size Distribution by Volume:
100% < 30 μ m (34-2D); 100% < 85 μ m (36).

Sample	Mean (μ m)	Median (μ m)
Core 34, subsegment 2D, Initial	8.68	6.05
Core 34, subsegment 2D, Duplicate	9.60	6.32
Core 36, 92-005 (random sample)	33.77	33.26

As with the number distribution, the volume distribution is represented by a probability volume density graph. The average particle size in the volume distribution is considerably larger than that of the number distribution. In Core 34 most of the particles are within the 2.0 to 20 micron range. In Core 36 most of the particles are much larger, with particle volumes widely dispersed in the 20 to 80 micron range.


The disparity between the two core sample measurements possibly indicates a difference in waste type. In Core 34-2D, over 50 percent of the particles in the sample have a diameter of less than 6 microns, with close agreement from the duplicate measurement. In the Core 36 sample over 50 percent of the particles have a diameter of less than 33 microns. In the retrieval and subsequent treatment of the tank wastes, it may be desirable to design pumping or filtration systems for the tank particulate. Therefore, the volume distribution of the particles should not be neglected (i.e., particles with diameters of over 33 microns should be considered in these designs).

5.3.5 Settling Behavior of Diluted Samples

This section analyzes the settling behavior for the 1:1 and 3:1 water/sample dilutions and the viscosity as a function of shear rate on the 3:1 dilution. All results for the as-received material and the viscosity for the 1:1 dilution have been previously reported (HASM 1993). The physical properties reported here include settling rates and volume percent settled solids, and weight percent and volume percent centrifuged solids for the 3:1 dilution and settling rates and volume percent settled solids for the 1:1 dilution. The experimental procedures used to perform these measurements were reported previously (HASM 1993).


The physical properties of the 1:1 and 3:1 dilutions are summarized in Table 5-13.

Figure 5-7. Single-Shell Tank Core 34, Particle Size Volume Density.



29304019.2

Figure 5-8. Single-Shell Tank Core 36, Particle Size Volume Density.



29304019.2

Table 5-13. Physical Properties Summary.

Property	Segment	
	1:1 Dilution	3:1 Dilution
Settled Solids (vol%)	74.4	72.4
Centrifuged Solids		
Vol%	NM	21.1
Wt%	NM	27.0
Density (g/ml)		
Sample	NM	1.11
Centrifuged Supernate	NM	1.01
Centrifuged Solid	NM	1.39

NM = No measurement.

No settling was observed in the as-received segment samples over a period of 3 days. Two dilutions (1:1 and 3:1 water to sample) were prepared, and the volume percent settled solids for each of the dilutions are plotted as a function of settling time (as shown below in Figures 5-9 and 5-10).

The 1:1 dilution reaches a final volume percent settled solids of 74.4 percent (avg.). Settling continues throughout the 3-day period, but the majority of the settling is seen in the first 30 hours. The 3:1 dilution reaches a final volume percent settled solids of 72.4 percent. The majority of the solids settling is complete within 24 hours. Figures 5-9 and 5-10 illustrate the setting behavior over time.

5.4 ANALYTICAL RESULTS--INDUCTIVELY COUPLED PLASMA-ATOMIC EMISSION SPECTROSCOPY

5.4.1 Inductively Coupled Plasma Assays--General Comments

No online multiple inter-element corrections were performed for matrix interferences. The ICP has built-in correction capability to adjust for moderate matrix interferences; however, this function does not perform well on samples containing weight percent quantities of iron, aluminum, or uranium. Single pass off-line corrections were performed to correct for high aluminum, iron, and uranium content in the samples. As requested, process blank values have not been subtracted from the reported values (except for nickel-fusion and Quality Control results). In the water digestion and drainable liquid assays, the single most prevalent element is sodium, by at least an order of magnitude. In the fusion assays, some elements (lead, for example) appear to be at high concentrations because of the large dilution factors required for fusion samples. Those analytes may actually only be present in concentrations marginally above the detection limit. Selenium routinely demonstrated a low bias; however, it is not a major analyte in the waste matrix. An estimate of

9313015-33

Figure 5-9. Settling Rate Data for Tank 241-C-112
Core 36, 1:1 Dilution.





Figure 5-10. Settling Rate Data for Tank 241-C-112
Core 36, 3:1 Dilution.



29304019.1

the detection limit for any analyte can be obtained by multiplying the analyte's DL (detection limit factor, based on dilution) by the appropriate sample " $\mu\text{g/g}$ factor" found in the data packages. Analytes reported in the data tables are those consistently contributing significant amounts to the composition of the waste matrix; average values for the analytes are reported to 3 significant figures based on two replicates. The full range of ICP analytes can be found in the full data packages (HASM 1993). All reported concentration values are based on grams of wet sample, unless otherwise specified.

Tables 5-14, 5-15, and 5-16 provide ICP analyte concentration information on the core composites as a function of the sample preparation.

Table 5-14. Water Digestion Chemical Composite Data--ICP
Average Values.

Analyte	Core 34 ($\mu\text{g/g}$ sample)	Core 35 ($\mu\text{g/g}$ sample)	Core 36 ($\mu\text{g/g}$ sample)
Al	315	330	814
Ca	240	339	385
Fe	1,630	712	1,390
Na	105,000	60,500	108,000
Ni	1,000	407	792
P	6,380	5,630	16,500
U	715	460	4,600

Table 5-15. Acid Digestion Chemical Composite Data--ICP
Average Values.

Analyte	Core 34 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 35 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 36 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
Al	23,300	44,600	5,530
Ca	21,700	11,500	17,000
Fe	20,100	26,000	19,500
Na	95,100	70,800	103,000
Ni	17,700	11,100	10,600
P	19,100	18,800	30,800
U	12,100	79,200	83,900

Table 5-16. Fusion Digestion Chemical Composite Data--ICP Average Values.

Analyte	Core 34 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 35 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 36 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
Al	29,800	45,000	6,410
Ca	28,900	15,000	20,400
Fe	22,800	32,400	26,000
Na	115,000	81,600	121,000
Ni*	30,000	19,900	12,800
P	22,000	21,200	36,800
U	14,400	89,700	105,000

Tables 5-17, 5-18, and 5-19 provide ICP analyte concentrations as a function of depth, i.e., for the subsegments.

Table 5-17. Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 ICP Analyte Trending (fusion prep on subsegments).

Subsegment	Al ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Ca ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Fe ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Na ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Ni* ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	P ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
1D	17,600	28,200	8,500	91,000	22,700	12,800
2B	32,400	21,700	14,700	89,000	22,200	11,100
2C	17,300	29,900	10,200	90,000	28,200	19,700
2D	26,900	23,800	19,700	78,600	23,500	19,500
W. Leach (Core. Comp)	315	240	1,630	105,000	1,000	6,380
D. Liquid	<DL	<DL	1,200	85,700	790	3,800

*Ni concentrations are potentially biased high. Values are derived from ICP fusion performed in a Ni crucible. However, in each case the blank value was an order of magnitude (or greater) less than the measurement. The fusion values are comparable with acid digestion values, where both are available.

Table 5-18. Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 ICP Analyte Trending
(fusion prep on subsegments).

Subsegment	Al ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Ca ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Fe ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Na ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Ni* ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	P ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
2D	45,000	15,000	32,400	81,600	19,900	22,200
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	330	339	712	60,500	407	5,630
D. Liquid	<DL	410	750	69,900	440	3,960

Table 5-19. Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 ICP Analyte Trending
(fusion prep on subsegments).

Subsegment	Al ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Ca ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Fe ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Na ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Ni* ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	P ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
1C	14,700	28,900	36,000	81,400	21,800	19,300
1D	4,000	28,600	7,500	81,700	23,000	19,300
2A	2,900	21,400	11,300	91,800	11,000	21,200
2B	3,100	8,900	8,900	90,600	4,800	25,200
2C	2,100	3,000	15,100	106,000	1,000	33,600
2D	3,000	2,100	31,200	105,100	900	29,900
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	814	385	1,390	108,000	792	16,500
D. Liquid	None	None	None	None	None	None

*Ni concentrations are potentially biased high. Values are derived from ICP fusion performed in a Ni crucible. However, in each case the blank value was an order of magnitude (or greater) less than the measurement. The fusion values are comparable with acid digestion values, where both are available.

5.4.2 Core 34

The ICP assays for the water leach of the core composite and drainable liquid samples were found to be quite similar. Because the drainable liquid is in equilibrium with the solids and the water leach is done at a 100:1 dilution, the similarity is unexpected. This similarity suggests that some soluble compounds have crystallized from the drainable liquid in the solids in addition to the insoluble materials. The water leach of drainable liquid samples were compared and used to determine RPDs for the analytes. RPDs were very close for all major analytes, within 2.5 percent.

The acid digestion assay for the drainable liquid gives results similar to those obtained from the core composite water leach. This treatment was done on a liquid sample to solubilize any particles suspended in the sample not removed by filtration. The major elements found were sodium, phosphorus, iron, uranium, nickel, potassium, and calcium. A full quality control suite was performed on the drainable liquid; the percent recovery for spiked samples and controls were excellent in each case (all recoveries were greater than 92.6 percent). On the solid samples, spike concentrations for iron, sodium, and nickel were insufficient for quantitation (i.e., the concentration of these analytes in the sample was too high for the spike to be detected). Results from the subsegments and core composites correlate reasonably well with the fusion results. RPDs are good (most are within 20 percent), except for calcium, iron, manganese, and zinc. The calcium anomaly is believed to be the result of a high system blank. The iron, manganese, and zinc RPDs are outside the typical 20 percent precision criteria. This behavior is demonstrated throughout the acid digestion analyses and was not unexpected. Both the In Farm simulant matrix and homogenization samples were highly resistant to acid dissolution, and the samples were expected to show similar behavior. The ICP homogenization test results showed no significant difference between the top and bottom samples of subsegments 2C and 2D, respectively. However, high RPDs for iron, manganese, zinc, and aluminum for each segment sample indicate the possibility of heterogeneity due to a crystalline or particle inclusion.

The RPDs for the fusion ICP assay were found to be generally good for the subsegment major analytes, routinely within 20 percent. However, there was not enough sample to perform a duplicate measurement on the core composite. The fusion results correlate reasonably well with the acid digestion assay, within 30 percent for major analytes. This difference between acid and fusion digestion ICP results further indicates the high insolubility of the waste. A high iron process blank was found in this sample, and its source is undetermined.

5.4.3 Core 35

The ICP assays for the direct drainable liquid and acid digestion of the drainable liquid samples were found to be almost identical and quite similar to the water leach of the core composite. RPDs were very good for all major analytes (within 20 percent).

The acid digestion assay for the drainable liquid gives results similar to those obtained from the core composite water leach. A full quality control suite was performed on the drainable liquid percent recovery for spiked samples, and controls were excellent in each case (above 90 percent for major analytes). The predominant elements found were sodium, phosphorus, iron, uranium, nickel, potassium, and calcium. On the solid samples, spike concentrations for iron, sodium, and nickel were again insufficient for quantitation. RPDs were generally higher than Core 34, but within 20 percent, except for calcium, iron, and low concentration analytes near the detection limit in the 5x dilution run (the sample was diluted to five times its original volume). Concentrations of 8 to 9 percent uranium, 4 to 5 percent aluminum, and 3 percent iron make accurate inter-element correction for matrix interferences difficult; thus, the high concentration levels of many

"unlikely" analytes (such as lanthanum, neodymium, and thallium) are probably the result of inadequate interelement correction. RPDs for most analytes significantly above the quantitation limit were within the duplicate precision criteria of 20 percent, except for aluminum, uranium, and phosphorus. Duplicate analyses for this assay were unusual--nearly all analytes found in the duplicate are 15 to 20 percent lower than the original. The exception in this case is aluminum, which was 30 percent higher. This behavior suggests that the poor RPDs are the result of an aluminum compound inclusion. The homogenization test showed no significant difference for subsegment 2D top and bottom. The RPDs were acceptable; consequently, the homogenization of the samples was considered adequate. The homogenization test values compared well with the core composite results. Some small silicon inhomogeneity was observed.

The fusion assay appears to improve quantitation for aluminum and silicon. Results for analytes that require significant uranium correction and have low concentration should be considered qualitative (chromium, calcium, titanium, barium, lanthanum). RPDs for major analytes are good (within 15 percent).

5.4.4 Core 36

There was no drainable liquid associated with these samples. Water leach RPDs of the core composites were found to be poor (generally above 25 percent). This behavior is attributed to differences in particle size and solubility in the aliquots used to make the composite.

The acid digestion values for the core composite correlate well with the fusion results. RPDs on 1x and 5x dilutions are very good except for calcium and analytes near the detection limit in the 5x dilution run (potassium, lanthanum, neodymium, thallium, and vanadium). RPDs for all analytes that are above the quantitation limit were within the 20 percent process control criteria. Percent recovery for spiked samples and controls was good except for those analytes for which the spike was less than 25 percent of the measured sample concentration. Digestion spike concentrations for aluminum, calcium, iron, manganese, sodium, nickel, and uranium were insufficient for percent recovery quantitation. As previously noted, selenium demonstrates a low bias (50 percent) for both spiked samples and controls. The homogenization tests on subsegments 1C, top and bottom, and 2D, top and bottom, showed no significant variation within the subsegment (<10% RPD). However, a large variation is observed between the two subsegments. This behavior was expected from the process history of the tank (e.g., the waste heel that remained prior to adding scavenged waste). Based on sample RPDs, the homogenization of the samples appears adequate.

The RPDs for the fusion ICP assay were found to be generally good for the subsegments and core composite major analytes, each within 20 percent. RPD for iron is good, contrasted with poor RPD for iron in the acid assay. This also suggests a minor sample inhomogeneity.

5.5 ANALYTICAL RESULTS—ION CHROMATOGRAPHY

5.5.1 Ion Chromatography Assays—General Comments

IC analyses were performed on water-leached samples of the subsegments, core composites, and diluted samples of the drainable liquid (where applicable). Matrix components in some of the samples were found to affect detector performance reversibly during the analysis for free cyanide; thus, a modification to the procedure using pulsed electrode cleaning between sample injections was incorporated to overcome that effect. In addition, the free cyanide assay produced much higher results than those anticipated from the simulant studies. No spike or control standard was used for the free cyanide analysis; therefore, these results may not be representative of the free cyanide in the samples. Quantitation for fluoride (and possibly chloride) was compromised by a co-eluting matrix interference, probably organics of some type. This supposition is supported by the TOC results from the water leach samples. The TOC values, although not high, are large enough to potentially interfere with fluoride and chloride detection. Further information regarding the IC analytes can be found in the full data packages (HASM 1993).

Table 5-20 shows the concentration of IC analytes for each core composite sample. Tables 5-21, 5-22, and 5-23 provide IC analyte concentrations as a function of depth. Tables 5-24, 5-25, and 5-26 provide additional information on other anions such as total cyanide as a function of depth. These anions were not determined by the IC method. Reported pH values for the subsegments and core composites are for 1:100 diluted samples; therefore, only the pH measurement of the drainable liquids (direct pH measurements) are meaningful. The TOC and total inorganic carbon (TIC) assays are not considered capable of measuring the total cyanide in the waste because they depend on acid dissolutions to perform the analyses.

5.5.2 Core 34

Fluoride spike recovery in the core composite was 50 percent; the poor recovery was attributed to matrix interference. All other spike recoveries (where applicable) ranged between 87 and 139 percent, indicating some minor matrix interferences (generally biased high). Control standard recoveries ranged from 87 to 112 percent, indicating that the analysis was in control at the time of the assays. The drainable liquid results are similar to the core composite and subsegment water leach results. This suggests a liquid in saturated equilibrium with the solid core material. RPDs were within 15 percent for all IC anions.

Table 5-20. Anion Analyses--Composite Data Results.

Analyte	Core 34 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 35 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Core 36 ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
NO_2^-	62,000	34,500	52,500
NO_3^-	80,000	43,500	71,500
PO_4^{3-}	19,100	17,850	49,500
SO_4^{2-}	15,600	8,600	13,700
Cl^-	1,300	750	1,050
F^-	1,000	300	450
Free CN^-	2,050	780	1,300
Total Carbon ¹	11,700	6,100	7,000
TOC ¹	3,100	1,200	3,100
TIC ¹	8,600	4,900	4,000
Total Cyanide ²	9,700	NM	7,100

¹Total Carbon, TOC, and TIC are not IC analyses, but are probably present as anions ($\text{TOC} + \text{TIC} = \text{Total carbon}$). Thus, it seems appropriate to include them with this table.

²Total Cyanide is not an IC anion. Presently it is a developmental assay; however, the total cyanide assay is important in interpreting the data.

IC = Ion chromatography (NO_2^- , NO_3^- , PO_4^{3-} , SO_4^{2-} , Cl^- , F^- , Free CN^-).

NM = No measurement.

TIC = Total inorganic carbon.

TOC = Total organic carbon.

Note: All IC results are obtained from a water leach preparation.

Table 5-21. Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 IC Analyte Trending.

Subsegment	NO_2^- ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	NO_3^- ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	PO_4^{3-} ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	SO_4^{2-} ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Cl^- ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	F^- ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
1D	60,000	79,000	11,650	14,400	1,100	1,000
2B	53,500	69,500	12,100	13,050	1,000	900
2C	48,500	64,500	11,500	11,750	900	900
2D	45,500	59,500	17,500	11,150	850	950
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	62,000	80,000	19,100	15,600	1,300	1,000
D. Liquid	55,000	72,000	11,250	11,650	1,000	600

Table 5-22. Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 IC Analyte Trending.

Subsegment	NO ₂ ⁻ (μg/g)	NO ₃ ⁻ (μg/g)	PO ₄ ³⁻ (μg/g)	SO ₄ ²⁻ (μg/g)	Cl ⁻ (μg/g)	F ⁻ (μg/g)
2D	34,500	43,500	17,800	8,600	850	300
D. Liquid	46,000	58,500	12,900	10,900	900	300

Table 5-23. Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 IC Analyte Trending.

Subsegment	NO ₂ ⁻ (μg/g)	NO ₃ ⁻ (μg/g)	PO ₄ ³⁻ (μg/g)	SO ₄ ²⁻ (μg/g)	Cl ⁻ (μg/g)	F ⁻ (μg/g)
1C	48,000	62,000	16,600	12,050	900	450
1D	51,000	66,500	17,800	13,000	1,000	500
2A	48,500	66,000	22,850	12,400	900	500
2B	30,000	42,500	20,400	8,050	600	400
2C	32,000	46,000	40,500	8,600	650	400
2D	35,000	51,000	55,000	9,500	700	1,150
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	52,500	71,500	49,500	13,700	1,050	450
D. Liquid	None	None	None	None	None	None

Note: All IC results are obtained from a water leach preparation.

Table 5-24. Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Misc. Analyte Trending.

Subsegment	TIC (μg/g)	TOC (μg/g)	Free CN ⁻ (μg/g)	Wt% Total Carbon	pH
1D	7,700	4,900	1,900	1.3	9.77
2B	5,400	3,000	1,600	0.8	9.89
2C	5,200	3,100	1,400	0.8	9.31
2D	6,600	4,000	1,200	1.1	9.72
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	8,600	3,100	2,050	1.2	10.33
D. Liquid	5,600	2,000	1,600	0.7	10.30

Table 5-25. Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 Misc. Analyte Trending.

Subsegment	TIC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	TOC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Free CN^- ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Wt% Total Carbon	pH
2D	3,700	2,500	800	0.6	9.77
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	4,900	1,200	800	0.6	9.77
D. Liquid	4,700	1,400	1,000	0.6	10.47

Table 5-26. Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Misc. Analyte Trending.

Subsegment	TIC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	TOC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Free CN^- ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Wt% Total Carbon	pH
1C	4,000	8,200	1,100	1.1	9.12
1D	5,400	4,900	1,200	1.0	9.57
2A	4,500	3,900	1,200	0.9	9.54
2B	2,500	2,700	700	0.5	8.92
2C	3,400	2,900	800	0.6	9.29
2D	2,900	2,300	900	0.5	9.36
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	5,300	1,400	1,300	0.7	9.2
D. Liquid	None	None	None	None	None

5.5.3 Core 35

IC analyses were performed on drainable liquid and core composite water leach samples. Samples exhibited characteristic poor spike recovery for fluoride (40 percent). Spike recoveries for the other anions indicate minimal matrix interferences. The water leach sample spike recoveries for NO_3^- , PO_4^{3-} , and SO_4^{2-} were significantly higher than normal (136 percent, 129 percent, and 122 percent, respectively). This behavior was attributed to sample inhomogeneity by the investigator. Control standard recoveries ranged from 83 percent to 112 percent; chloride showed a recovery of 132 percent. Other chloride spike controls run at the same time showed 96 percent and 92 percent recovery. Analyses were considered in control at the time of the assays. The drainable liquid samples exhibited good RPDs for all anions, within 5 percent. Analyte concentrations in the drainable liquid corresponds with the concentrations in the water leach samples.

5.5.4 Core 36

IC analyses were performed on subsegment and core composite water leach samples. No drainable liquid was recovered with the Core 36 samples. Subsegment 36-1C water leach samples exhibited characteristic poor spike recovery and RPD for fluoride (37 percent and 22 percent, respectively). Spike recoveries for the other anions ranged from 80 percent to 111 percent, indicating minimal matrix interferences. Control standard recoveries ranged from 91 to 107 percent. The analyses were considered in control. Consistent behavior between subsegments was found for NO_2^- , NO_3^- , and SO_4^{2-} , chloride, and free cyanide (i.e., when NO_2^- is low, free cyanide is low, etc.), possibly indicating a matrix interference for free cyanide from the other anions. Phosphate and fluoride showed significant differences and do not, in general, track the behavior of the other anions. This is possibly associated with an intrinsic sample inhomogeneity relative to these anions or a heterogeneity associated with tank 241-C-112 itself (i.e., a waste heel). The core composite water leach results magnify the effect of the sample inhomogeneity/tank heterogeneity. This poor reproducibility of sample and duplicate is common for inorganic water leach assays on this sample matrix. RPDs are consistently high for all analytes, ranging from 22 to 43 percent.

5.6 ANALYTICAL RESULTS--RADIOCHEMISTRY

5.6.1 Radiochemistry Assays--General Comments

Analyses appear to be consistent. Total beta measurements calculated using ^{90}Sr detector efficiencies are largely in agreement with the sum of the major beta emitters, ^{90}Sr and ^{137}Cs . Similarly, the total alpha values show good agreement with the sum of the neptunium, plutonium, and americium/curium values. The gamma energy analyses results obtained from wet chemistry correlate with the results from the segment gamma scans. Detection of ^{137}Cs and most other radionuclides was observed to increase as a function of sample preparation. This was attributed to the ability of the sample preparation to dissolve the waste (KOH fusion dissolves the sample better than acid; acid dissolves the sample better than water). Uranium measurements were obtained from ICP fusion and laser fluorimetry, and show reasonably good agreement between Core 34 and 36. Core 35 has a large discrepancy between the two measurements, which can be attributed to matrix interferences or differences in sample particle size. Alpha energy analysis and GEA show good agreement for ^{241}Am . GEA analytical values are back-corrected to January 1, 1992, to account for decay.

Tables 5-27, 5-28, and 5-29 show the radionuclide concentrations found in the core composite samples. Tables 5-30, 5-31, and 5-32 show fission product concentration and uranium concentrations as a function of depth.

Table 5-27. Core Composite Fission Products (fusion prep).

Core No.	^{137}Cs ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{90}Sr ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{154}Eu ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{155}Eu ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{60}Co ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	Total Beta ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)
Core 34	750	3,500	1.25	1.27	0.03	7,070
Core 35	700	3,200	2.01	2.22	2.1 E-04	7,000
Core 36	800	510	0.156	ND	0.006	1,700

ND = Not detected.

Table 5-28. Core Composite Uranium.

Core No.	$\text{U}_{\text{ICP fusion}}$ ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	U_{FL} ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	^{238}U mass fraction	^{235}U mass fraction
Core 34	14,400	17,700	0.993107	0.006715
Core 35	89,700	44,300	0.993112	0.006761
Core 36	105,000	94,050	0.993100	0.006780

FL = Uranium measurement by laser fluorimetry.

Table 5-29. Core Composite Transuranics (fusion preparation).

Core No.	^{237}Np ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{238}Pu ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$ ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	$^{241}\text{Am}_{\text{GEA}}$ ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	$^{241}\text{Am}_{\text{AEA}}$ ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	Total α ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)
Core 34	6.62E-04	0.0137	0.155	0.76	0.613	0.95
Core 35	1.20E-03	0.0137	0.151	1.05	0.763	1.18
Core 36	4.09E-04	0.0033	0.0593	ND	0.0612	0.17

AEA = Measurement by alpha energy analysis.

GEA = Measurement by gamma energy analysis.

ND = Not detected.

Table 5-30. Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Radionuclide Trending (fusion preparation).

Subsegment	^{137}Cs ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{90}Sr ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	U_{ICP} ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
1D	240	1,300	None
2B	610	4,900	3,000
2C	800	1,100	5,700
2D	510	2,500	20,000
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	6.16	27.88*	715
Acid Digestion (D Liquid)	0.04	0.35	1,130

*Value from total beta analysis.

Table 5-31. Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 Radionuclide Trending (fusion preparation).

Subsegment	^{137}Cs ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{90}Sr ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	U_{ICP} ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
2D	700	3210	89,700
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	5.2	N.M.	460
Acid Digestion (D Liquid)	0.007	0.23	928

Drainable liquids are measured directly.

Table 5-32. Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Radionuclide Trending (fusion preparation).

Subsegment	^{137}Cs ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	^{90}Sr ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)	U_{ICP} ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
1C	560	1,900	4,400
1D	1,200	15	3,100
2A	880	20	40,000
2B	530	70	170,000
2C	100	140	110,000
2D	40	200	58,000
W. Leach (Core Comp.)	N.M.	11.8*	4,600
D. Liquid	None	None	None

*value from total beta analysis.

5.6.2 Core 34 Radiochemistry

Mass fractions for isotopic plutonium are $^{239}\text{Pu} = 0.93936$; $^{240}\text{Pu} = 0.0579$. The concentration of ^{238}U was too high to determine ^{238}Pu by mass spectrometry; thus, alpha energy analysis of the separated plutonium fraction was used to determine ^{238}Pu . Process sample blanks show small levels of contamination for selected isotopes. However, the contamination is negligible when compared to the activity in the solid samples. Radiochemical recoveries for specific analytes of interest for all samples are as follows: ^{90}Sr (92 to 105 percent), uranium (101 percent), ^{237}Np (94 percent), plutonium (92 percent), and americium/curium (103 percent).

5.6.3 Core 35 Radiochemistry

Uranium measurements from laser fluorimetry had an average chemical recovery of 104 percent. The neptunium, plutonium, and americium fractions were separated and counted. Plutonium concentration was too low to perform isotopic analysis by mass spectroscopy. Alpha energy analyses were used to determine isotopic plutonium ratios and other alpha emitter concentrations. Problems were encountered in performing the plutonium analysis of the drainable liquid; erratic results and behavior of the sample during analysis was observed.

5.6.4 Core 36 Radiochemistry

Mass fractions for isotopic plutonium are $^{239}\text{Pu} = 0.95887$; $^{240}\text{Pu} = 0.03943$. The concentration of ^{238}U was too high to determine ^{238}Pu by mass spectrometry; thus, alpha energy analysis of the separated plutonium fraction was used to determine ^{238}Pu . Process sample blanks show small levels of contamination for selected isotopes, similar to Core 34. The contamination is negligible when compared to the activity in the solid samples. These levels are significant for tritium and ^{60}Co measured by GEA; however, neither of those analytes contribute substantially to the radiological content of the waste. Radiochemical recoveries for specific analytes of interest for reagent or simulated matrix standards are as follows: ^{90}Sr (101 percent), uranium (107 percent), ^{237}Np (89 percent), plutonium (96 percent), and americium (100 percent).

5.7 ANALYTICAL RESULTS--ENERGETICS

Scanning TGA and DSC were performed on subsegment and core composite material obtained from tank 241-C-112. These two thermal analysis techniques are useful in determining the thermal stability or reactivity of a material. In DSC analysis, heat flow over and above the usual heat capacity of the substance is measured while the substance is exposed to a linear increase in temperature, i.e., $dT/dt = \text{Constant}$ (where T =temperature, and t =time). While the substance is being heated, air is passed over the waste material to remove any gases being released. The onset temperature for an endothermic or exothermic event on a DSC is determined graphically. The endpoints of the event are determined and a line is drawn between them to establish a base. A line tangent to the initial side of the event is drawn until it intersects

the base. From that point of intersection, a vertical line is constructed to the temperature scale at the bottom of the DSC curve; that temperature is the onset temperature of the event.

TGA measures the mass of a sample while the temperature of the sample is increased at a constant rate. Again, dT/dt is constant; the X-axis is representative of the running time of the analysis as well as the temperature increase of the sample during analysis. The Y-axis represents the weight percent of the sample and is effectively unitless. As with the DSC, air is passed over the sample during heating. Any decrease in the weight percent of the sample represents a loss of gaseous matter from the sample either through evaporation or through a reaction that forms gas phase products.

DSC is often used to measure thermal decomposition temperatures, heats of reaction, reaction temperatures, melting points, and solid-solid transition temperatures. TGA is used to measure thermal decomposition temperatures, water content, and reaction temperatures. The two methods often provide complementary information.

5.7.1 Remarks on the Interpretation of Differential Scanning Calorimetry/Thermogravimetric Analysis Data

Tables 5-33 and 5-34 summarize the results of the thermal analyses performed. There are three significant features seen on both the DSC and TGA plots. Several minor endotherms appear on the DSC, but only endotherms greater than 20 J/g were considered as significant features of the plot. The values presented in the tables do not exactly match the values recorded on the DSC and TGA plots. This is because interpreting these semi-quantitative analyses requires considerable experience and judgement on the part of the analyst. The values presented represent the best summary evaluation of the data (Tingey 1993). Although the temperature ranges observed for the various transitions in the DSC and TGA assays do not exactly match, the weight losses and thermal events in the observed transitions are considered related and usually in the same vicinity.

There is a concern regarding the choice of cover gas affecting the DSC and TGA results. Air was used in the assays instead of an inert gas because that is what the test instructions directed. However, oxygen in the air may contribute to the oxidation of the sample and alter the reaction (Pederson et al. 1993). This condition is not considered representative of the potential reaction conditions in the tank; therefore, future DSC/TGA tests will be performed under an inert cover gas.

Table 5-33. Thermogravimetric Analysis Results
from Tank 241-C-112.

Core Sample	Total Wt% loss	Transition 1 Wt% loss	Transition 2 Wt% loss	Transition 3 Wt% loss
34-1D	20.2	6.6	13.6	N.A.
34-2B	56.8	52	5.4	-0.6
34-2C	48.7	45	4.0	-0.3
34-2D	39.3	33	6.3	0
34-Comp.	40.5	35	6.1	-0.6
35-2D	48.0	42	6.0	0
36-1C	54.6	46	8.9	-0.3
36-1D	51.8	52	2.0	-0.2
36-2A	53.7	52	1.9	-0.2
36-2B	41.0	38	3.1	-0.1
36-2C	44.8	41	3.8	0
36-2D	50.8	47	3.5	0.3
36-Comp.	54.2	44	2.9	0.3

Table 5-34. Differential Scanning Calorimetry Energetics Results from Tank 241-C-112.

Core Sample	Transition 1			Transition 2			Transition 3		
	Range (°C)	Onset (°C)	ΔH (J/g)	Range (°C)	Onset (°C)	ΔH (J/g)	Range (°C)	Onset (°C)	ΔH (J/g)
34-1D	58-110	62	30	206-312	215	515	356-444	375	-17
34-2B	30-240	30	847	260-300	276	-12	300-400	349	
34-2C	30-240	30	795	260-300	267	-13	300-400	360	
34-2D	33-240	33	930	260-300	289	-17	300-400	347	
34-Comp.	34-240	34	734	260-300	276	-11	300-400	357	
35-2D	34-195	34	780	225-290	230	-12			
36-1C	34-240	34	1,070	260-300	267	-11	300-380	301	31
36-1D	32-230	32	1,310	260-310	277	-16	(a)	NA	
36-2A	30-230	30	1,110	277-300	280	-10	300-400	305	35
36-2B	33-235	30	870	260-325	298	-9	325-400	330	28
36-2C	33-240	32	830	(a)	NA	None	305-407	320	36
36-2D	34-172	34	1,060	(a)	NA	None	300-395	328	45
36-Comp.	34-172	34	880	270-325	288	-19	(a)	NA	

(a) This transition is not quantifiable.

NOTE: To convert from J to cal, divide by 4.18.

NOTE: Negative ΔH indicates an exotherm.

NA = Not applicable.

5.7.2 General Comments on the Differential Scanning Calorimetry/Thermogravimetric Analysis Behavior of the Samples

The first transition in each sample is endothermic, begins at the lower temperature limit of the analysis (30 °C), and is essentially complete between 140 °C and 200 °C. The most likely phenomenon occurring in this region are the release of the bulk and interstitial water in the core sample material. The endotherms exhibited in this region are quite substantial (typically, 700 to 1,200 J/g). These values are per gram of wet sample; if divided by the mass fraction lost during analysis, they range from 1,400 to 2,600 J/g and correspond generally with the heat of vaporization of water (2,260 J/g). In addition, the majority of the weight percent change observed in the TGA curve occurs over this same temperature range. The TGA water content corresponds closely (but not exactly) with the water loss observed in a gravimetric weight percent solids determination. Some of this discrepancy is attributable to the time elapsed between the two assays. In some cases, up to two months pass between the gravimetric weight percent solids assay and the TGA measurement. Extended exposure to the ambient hot cell conditions are believed to have dried the sample somewhat in that period of time; thus, some of the water content measurements may be biased low. The warm, dry conditions in the hot cell will remove moisture between the time of the sample assays. However, the results from the two methods are generally in agreement (Core 35 was an anomaly).

Exotherms and additional weight loss are routinely detected between 260 to 300 °C in all the samples. Similar exotherms and weight changes have been observed in previous thermal analysis studies of $\text{Cs}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$ (Scheele et al. 1991) and other simulant materials (Bechtold 1992; Jeppson 1993). As reported previously, the dried simulant materials demonstrate much larger exothermic responses than those observed in tank 241-C-112 waste. However, the magnitude of the exotherms observed correlates roughly with the predicted exotherms derived from the amount of cyanide present in the waste (refer to Table 5-35 and 5-36), based on the Fauske (1992) determined value of -3.95 kJ/g $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$. The weight losses are attributed to the loss of gaseous reaction products and waters of hydration.

Table 5-35. Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Energetic Comparison.

Subsegment	Wt% Total Cyanide (dry)	Equivalent Wt% Total Ferrocyanide (dry)	Theoretical Heat of Reaction (cal/g dry waste)	Measured Heat of Reaction (cal/g dry waste)
1D	0.52	1.06	-10.0	-5.1
2B	0.43	0.87	-8.3	-6.7
2C	0.83	1.69	-15.9	-6.1
2D	0.75	1.52	-14.4	-6.7
Composite	0.97	1.97	-18.6	-4.4

NOTE: 1 cal = 4.18 J.

Table 5-36. Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Energetic Comparison.

Subsegment	Wt% Total Cyanide (dry)	Equivalent Wt% Total Ferrocyanide (dry)	Theoretical Heat of Reaction (cal/g dry waste)	Measured Heat of Reaction (cal/g dry waste)
1C	NM	NM	NM	-5.8
1D	0.72	1.46	-13.8	-8.0
2A	0.92	1.87	-17.7	-5.2
2B	0.75	1.52	-14.4	-3.7
2C	0.40	0.81	-7.7	No exotherm
2D	0.56	1.14	-10.8	No exotherm
Composite	0.71	1.44	-13.6	-8.6

NM = No measurement.

NOTE: 1 cal = 4.18 J.

There is an observable third transition range, but here the energetic behavior is not readily quantifiable. Initially, Cores 34 and 35 appeared to have some significant exothermic behavior detected in the temperature range between 300 to 440 °C. In the Core 36 materials, the investigator detected no exothermic activity in this temperature range. This difference in behavior was unexpected, especially in light of small, but detectable, cyanide and organic levels in the waste, suggesting the potential for a corresponding exotherm. Further analysis of the DSC results suggests that the observed activity was the consequence of subtracting a rapidly changing baseline measurement from the analytical results. Therefore, it is believed that there is no quantifiable exothermic activity in that temperature range. This interpretation is contrary to previously released information. A minor weight gain was sometimes observed in this temperature range, most likely an oxidation of some type.

The properties related to energetics are illustrated for each core in Tables 5-37, 5-38, and 5-39. The results for the samples from 34-1D, 36-2C, and 36-2D indicate that these samples differ in thermal behavior from most of the other samples, further suggesting a difference in waste type.

Table 5-37. Tank 241-C-112 Core 34 Energetics Trending.

Subsegment	Wt% Total Cyanide (dry)	Wt% Total Organic Carbon	Wt% Total Carbon	Wt% Water (Grav.)	Wt% Water (TGA)	Average Heat of Reaction (kJ/g dry waste)
1D	0.52	0.49	1.3	45	20	-0.02
2B	0.43	0.30	0.8	53	57	-0.03
2C	0.83	0.31	0.8	58	49	-0.03
2D	0.75	0.40	1.1	52	39	-0.03
Composite	0.97	0.31	NM	38	41	-0.02

Table 5-38. Tank 241-C-112 Core 35 Energetics Trending.

Subsegment	Wt% Total Cyanide (dry)	Wt% Total Organic Carbon	Wt% Total Carbon	Wt% Water (Grav.)	Wt% Water (TGA)	Average Heat of Reaction (kJ/g dry waste)
2D	NM	0.25	0.6	34	48	-0.02

Table 5-39. Tank 241-C-112 Core 36 Energetics Trending.

Subsegment	Wt% Total Cyanide (dry)	Wt% Total Organic Carbon	Wt% Total Carbon	Wt% Water (Grav.)	Wt% Water (TGA)	Average Heat of Reaction (kJ/g dry waste)
1C	N.M.	0.82	1.1	49	55	-0.02
1D	0.72	0.49	1.0	58	52	-0.03
2A	0.92	0.39	0.9	57	54	-0.02
2B	0.75	0.27	0.5	41	41	-0.02
2C	0.40	0.29	0.6	64	45	No exotherm
2D	0.56	0.23	0.5	56	51	No exotherm
Composite	0.71	0.14	0.7	45	47	-0.04

Heats of Reaction are calculated using the TGA wt% water value.
NOTE: 1 kcal = 4.18 kJ.

The TOC and TIC assays are not considered capable of measuring the total cyanide in the waste because they depend on acid dissolutions to perform the analyses.

5.8 ANALYTICAL RESULTS - POTENTIAL WASTE CONSTITUENTS

5.8.1 Mass Balances

A method to help ensure that the data are acceptable is to perform a mass balance on the core composite sample data. This activity functions as a rough quality control check, and also provides insight to some of the properties of the matrix. To do this, the assumption in performing the mass balance is that the anions, cations, and water are all associated in some manner, but the exact chemistry of the association is not considered. Analytes contributing less than 0.2 wt% (generally trace ICP analytes, AA analytes, and radionuclides) are considered negligible in this assessment. The assays that contributed analytes to the mass balance were the ICP fusion, IC, total carbon, total cyanide assays, and the gravimetric wt% water measurement. The ICP fusion value does not include nickel, which is a significant analyte in the sample but may be biased high. However, for the purpose of this exercise, the nickel value from the respective acid leach preparations will be inserted into the total mass of ICP fusion analytes to account for it.

Without considering the physical and chemical properties of the waste matrix and the context of the process history, the mass balances produced from these assays account for 77.2 to 97.9 percent of the mass. However, this range of recovery is expected because it is known that there are analytes present that were not measured in the analysis of the samples. The IC anion analysis only measures the water-soluble components; there is a substantial insoluble residue that must contain additional anions. There is no measurement of the sulfide content in any of the assays, even though it has been previously established that 28,100 g-mol of S^{2-} was used in scavenging ^{60}Co . Thus, an additional contribution of 2100 $\mu g/g$ has been estimated as necessary to aid in closing the balance. Bismuth was not reported in the assays, and $BiPO_4$ first cycle waste was recorded as being disposed here, introducing a potential shortfall.

Aluminum is likely to be present as $Al(OH)_3$, and other transition metals are also likely to be present as hydroxides or hydrous metal oxides. Neither hydroxide ion or oxide content has been measured in the waste, which introduces additional sources of shortfalls in the recovery. Therefore, multipliers for aluminum (2.9), iron (1.6), nickel (1.6), and uranium (1.3) will be used to account for the unmeasured hydroxide or oxygen, which are assumed to be present in combination with these analytes. Only metals making weight percent contributions to the waste matrix will be adjusted in this manner; the trace metals will be assumed to be lost in the error of the major constituents. Adjustments will be made individually for TOC, TIC, and total cyanide. It is assumed that the TOC and TIC assays did not consume or measure any cyanide present. In addition, a significant disparity can be corrected by comparing the soluble phosphorus from the water leach ICP (and assuming that it is PO_4^{3-}), PO_4^{3-} values from the IC, and the phosphorus from the ICP fusion assay; the phosphate was found to be only 27 to 44 percent soluble. The water leach ICP and IC values agree within 3 percent, strongly suggesting that the soluble phosphorus in the waste matrix is present as PO_4^{3-} . The process history of the tank also indicates that large amounts of phosphate were used to encourage precipitate formation. Therefore, an assumption that the phosphorus in the fusion assay represents an insoluble PO_4^{3-} is not

unwarranted. Convert the phosphorus in the ICP assay to PO_4^{3-} and add it along with the water soluble phosphate and other anions. A minor accounting shift is now necessary to avoid double counting (subtract the ICP fusion phosphorous value).

Accounting for the analytes in this manner aids in closing agreement and improving the percent recoveries to between 96.6 percent and 119.3 percent (near quantitative recoveries). However, there remain some aspects of the waste matrices that require examination. Tables 5-40, 5-41, and 5-42 present mass balances that have been adjusted to compensate for the contributions of unmeasured (but likely) analytes combined with the measured analytes. There may have been some error introduced from drying of the sample during the preparation of the core composite, especially in the case of Core 34, where the subsegments have a substantially higher water content than does the core composite, biasing the results low. In the case of Core 35, the disparity between the gravimetric water measurement and the TGA water content also suggests (1) drying of the sample before the gravimetric assay; or (2) incomplete drying during the gravimetric test, which biases the results low.

Table 5-40. Adjusted Mass Balance: Core 34 Composite.

Assay	Concentration ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
ICP--Fusion (+ Ni from acid leach; -P; Al, Fe, Ni, U, adjustments)	329,000
IC Anions (TOC, TIC, and CN^- adjustments; +P as PO_4^{3-} ; + S^{2-})	306,000
Gravimetric Water	380,000
Total (1,000,000 $\mu\text{g/g}$)	1,015,000

Table 5-41. Adjusted Mass Balance: Core 35 Composite.

Assay	Concentration ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
ICP--Fusion (+ Ni from acid leach; -P; Al, Fe, Ni, U, adjustments)	414,000
IC Anions (TOC, TIC, and CN^- adjustments; +P as PO_4^{3-} ; + S^{2-})	212,000
Gravimetric Water	340,000
Total (1,000,000 $\mu\text{g/g}$)	966,000

9305-5406-60

Table 5-42. Adjusted Mass Balance: Core 36 Composite.

Assay	Concentration ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
ICP--Fusion (+ Ni from acid leach; -P; Al, Fe, Ni, U, adjustments)	404,000
IC Anions (TOC, TIC, CN^- adjustments; +P as PO_4^{3-} ; + S^{2-})	339,000
Gravimetric Water	450,000
Total (1,000,000 $\mu\text{g/g}$)	1,193,000

5.8.2 Suggested Components of Waste Matrix

The actual composition of the waste matrix is quite complex, and trace amounts of various compounds probably exist in the tank. However, with some simple assumptions regarding how the anions and cations will combine, a list of the most probable compounds that exist in the waste matrix and contribute significantly to its overall makeup can be developed.

Table 5-43 is a condensed version of a more general chart found on page D-147 in the *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics 64th Ed.* (Weast 1984). It provides solubility data on some of the most common anions and cations.

Table 5-43. Probable Solids in the Waste Matrix.

	NO_2^-	NO_3^-	PO_4^{3-}	SO_4^{2-}	OH^-	CN^- (as $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$)	CO_3^{2-}	S^{2-}
Al^{+3}			PPT		PPT	PPT		NL
Ca^{+2}			PPT	PPT			PPT	
$\text{Fe}^{+2,+3}$					PPT	PPT	PPT	PPT
Na^+								
Ni^{+2}			PPT		PPT	PPT	PPT	PPT
U^{+6}		NL	PPT	PPT	PPT			PPT

PPT = Precipitate forms.

NL = Precipitate formation not likely under tank conditions.

From the earlier tables and process information, chloride, fluoride, sulfide, and even ferrocyanide will not be significant mass contributors to the waste matrix. Sulfide and cyanide precipitates are significant because they provide a potential fuel source; however, it is generally believed that the sulfides were eventually converted to sulfates. Sodium, NO_2^- , and NO_3^- are highly soluble, and thus probably do not contribute much to the insoluble solids. However, sodium, nitrite, and nitrate contribute significantly to the

overall solids content of the waste (dissolved + insoluble solids). In addition, they represent three of the four most prevalent analytes, after water, in the waste. No analytical measurement of hydroxide was made, but it is known that in the process history of tank 241-C-112, basic solutions were added routinely to the tank. The following is a list of likely candidates for the insoluble solids.

- Aluminum hydroxide, $\text{Al}(\text{OH})_3$
- Aluminum phosphate, AlPO_4
- Tetraaluminum ferrocyanide, $\text{Al}_4[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]_3$
- Calcium phosphate, $\text{Ca}_3(\text{PO}_4)_2$
- Calcium sulfate, CaSO_4
- Calcium carbonate, CaCO_3
- Iron carbonate, FeCO_3
- Iron(II) hydroxide, $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2$
- Iron(III) hydroxide, $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_3$
- Iron(II) phosphate, $\text{Fe}_3(\text{PO}_4)_2$
- Iron(III) phosphate, FePO_4
- Iron sulfide, FeS
- Iron(III) ferrocyanide, $\text{Fe}_4[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]_3$
- Disodium nickel ferrocyanide, $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
- Nickel carbonate, NiCO_3
- Nickel sulfide, NiS
- Nickel hydroxide, $\text{Ni}(\text{OH})_2$
- Dinickel ferrocyanide, $\text{Ni}_2\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6$
- Uranyl phosphate, $\text{UO}_2\text{HPO}_4 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$
- Uranyl hydroxide, $\text{UO}_2(\text{OH})_2$
- Uranyl sulfide, UO_2S
- Uranyl sulfate, $2(\text{UO}_2\text{SO}_4) \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$.

The ^{137}Cs present is still apparently bound with the ferrocyanide, and the ^{90}Sr is probably bound with phosphate, carbonate, or sulfate.

5.8.3 Comparison to Theoretical Estimates and Simulant Studies

Agreement between synthetic sludge properties and observed waste material characteristics is within the constraints of the synthetic recipes and assumptions regarding chemical behavior in tank 241-C-112. Comparisons with Core 35 were not made because of its small sample size. On this basis it was assumed that valid comparisons could not be made, and that Core 35 was not a representative sample of the tank waste. Table 5-44 compares some properties and analyte concentrations of the waste materials and comparable simulants.

Table 5-44. Tank 241-C-112 Comparison of Waste Material with Simulants for Selected Analytes.

Analyte	In Farm 2 simulant values	Core 34 values subsegment range (composite value)	Core 36 values subsegment range (composite value)
Ni ug/g*	18,700	22,200 to 28,300 (30,000)	900 to 23,000 (12,800)
Wt% H ₂ O Gravimetric	51	45 to 58 (38)	41 to 64 (45)
Wt% Total Cyanide dry basis	9.1 to 11.3	0.43 to 0.83 (0.97)	0.40 to 0.92 (0.71)
ΔH kJ/dry g	-1.2	-0.01 to -0.03 (-0.02)	-0.01 to -0.03 (-0.04)
Density g/ml	1.39**	Bulk Value: 1.5 to 1.6	Bulk Value: 1.3 to 1.6

*Ni analysis is potentially biased high. Values are derived from ICP fusion performed in a Ni crucible. However, in each case the blank value was an order of magnitude (or greater) less than the measurement. The fusion values are comparable with acid digestion values, where both are available.

**Centrifuged for 30 g-yr.

5.9 RCRA-TYPE ANALYSIS: DATA VALIDATION/VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

5.9.1 Chemical Data

Data validation procedures for chemical data were in place during the analysis of tank 241-C-112. The data validation and verification procedures followed to ensure reliable data for *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA)-type samples are described in detail in WHC-CM-5-3, *Sample Management and Administration*, Section 2.0. A brief list of the requirements for data packages are as follows:

- Requested versus Reported Analyses
- Analysis Holding Times
- Matrix Spike/
Matrix Spike Duplicate Analysis
- Surrogate Recoveries
- Duplicate Analysis
- Analytical Blank Analysis
- Additional Quality Assurance (QA)/
Quality Control (QC) Oversight, as
designated in the Statement of Work (SOW)
- Initial and Continuing Instrument
Calibration
- Gas chromatograph (GC)/mass
spectrometer (MS) Tune Criteria
(GC/MS analysis)
- Internal Standards (GC analysis)
- Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)
- Interference Check Sample (ICP)

When determining the quality of the chemical data for tank 241-C-112, it is useful to consider the results of several of the quality control assays.

Blanks, matrix spikes, duplicates, and control samples can all provide further insight to the data and its reliability. Potential sample contamination problems are addressed using analytical blanks. Confounding effects of the sample matrix are resolved using matrix spike results. Duplicate analysis compares the difference between the replicate samples, providing an indication of laboratory precision (and in some cases, sample heterogeneity). The laboratory control sample offers a monitor of overall performance of an analytical method in all steps of the analysis. Overall, there were few problems with the data validation and compliance with established quality control criteria. The 241-C-112 samples were generally free from calibration and contamination errors (Core 36 was an exception to this). In addition, the interference control standards, matrix spike, laboratory control standard, and holding time requirements were largely met. Most of the observed out-of-control or out-of-limit problems were observed in the blank and duplicate assays of the trace analytes. In some cases, the sample behavior of the duplicate assays was attributed to significant sample heterogeneity. In almost all cases, the data obtained was qualifiable and usable. Appendix D contains the core sample data output and the associated quality assurance documentation.

5.9.2 Radiological Data

Similarly, the data validation and verification procedures followed to ensure reliable data for radioactive, high-level, RCRA-type samples are also described in detail in WHC-CM-5-3, *Sample Management and Administration*, Section 2.4. They differ somewhat from the requirements for chemical data. A brief list of the requirements for data packages are as follows:

- Chain of Custody
- Requested vs. Reported Analyses
- Efficiency Checks
- Matrix Spikes/Tracers/Carriers
- Additional QA/QC Oversight, as designated in the SOW
- Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)
- Initial Calibration
- Preparation Blank Analysis
- Duplicate Analysis
- Background Checks

When determining the quality of the radiological data for tank 241-C-112, it is also useful to consider the results of several of the quality control assays. Chain-of-custody, calibrations, efficiency and background checks, blanks, matrix spikes/tracers/carriers, duplicate analyses, and laboratory control samples can all provide further insight to the data and its reliability. Potential sample contamination problems or loss of sample control are addressed in using a chain-of-custody. Initial calibrations, efficiency and background checks, and analytical blanks ensure that the equipment is operating correctly and further address contamination problems. Confounding effects of the sample matrix are resolved using matrix spike/tracers/carriers. Duplicate analysis compares the difference between the replicate samples, providing an indication of laboratory precision (and in some cases, sample heterogeneity). The laboratory control sample offers a monitor of overall performance of an analytical method in all steps of the analysis. In the case of the radiological data, there were several problems with the data validation and compliance with established quality control criteria. The 241-C-112 chain-of-custody documentation was in order, thus sample integrity was not lost. In addition, the sample blank results

indicated that samples were generally free from contamination errors. However, there are several problems in compliance with the established QC criteria for initial calibrations, efficiency checks, matrix spike/tracers/carriers, and the use of laboratory control standards for these samples. These concerns were addressed and responded to in the PNL Technical Task Plan, which outlined the alternative quality control criteria that would be adhered to during the analysis of the samples. WHC agreed to the criteria outlined in the PNL TPP and a formal audit response has been issued to clarify the matter further. In almost all cases, the radiological data obtained was qualifiable and usable. Appendix D contains the core sample data output and the associated quality assurance documentation.

This page intentionally left blank.

2010-5-10-13

6.0 INTERPRETATION OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS

6.1 TANK 241-C-112 WASTE PROFILE

Tank 241-C-112 received four major types of waste likely to deposit solids during its operating history. The waste types, in order, were as follows:

- Bismuth phosphate first cycle decontamination waste (1C)
- Unscavenged uranium recovery waste (UR)
- Ferrocyanide-scavenged waste (FeCN) from scavenging of UR waste initially stored in other tanks
- Cladding wastes (CW).

A small volume of strontium semiworks waste subsequently was received by the tank and a relatively large volume of B Plant ion-exchange waste after that. These last wastes would not be expected to contribute large amounts of solids to the tank. The purpose of this section is to attempt to identify the location of the tank waste solids, thereby allowing estimation of the tank inventory for various analytes of importance.

The approach taken to identify the waste profile was to examine the subsegment assays for analytes distinct to the waste types that were disposed in the tank, and combine that information with what is known regarding the tank's process history. The first waste placed in the tank, via the cascade inlet from tank 241-C-111, was BiPO₄ 1C waste. This waste would be comparatively high in bismuth, phosphate, and aluminum because aluminum decladding waste was combined with it. The 1C solids volume was measured as 57,000 L (15,000 gal) in 1952 (Anderson 1990). This volume would amount to 32.8 cm (12.9 in.) in the tank bottom. The tank next received UR waste with solids comparatively high in uranium and iron and low in bismuth and aluminum. The available records do not show whether this waste was added directly to the tank or via the cascade overflow line from tank 241-C-111. Assuming direct addition to tank 241-C-112, the estimated volume of these solids would be approximately 55,000 L (14,500 gal) at 1.8 vol% of the waste input. This corresponds to 13.5 cm (5.3 in.) distributed evenly across the tank.

The tank then received ferrocyanide-scavenged waste. The solids from this waste would be high in nickel, calcium, cyanide (as ferrocyanide), ¹³⁷Cs, and uranium, although the uranium may have settled out in the tank originally receiving the UR waste. Because some of the ferrocyanide waste feed was concentrated 1C waste (evaporator bottoms), the waste could also be high in aluminum. The estimated solids volume in tank 241-C-112 at the end of the scavenging program was between 174,000 and 318,000 L (46,000 and 84,000 gal). This would amount to 61.5 to 96.5 cm (24.2 to 38.0 in.) distributed evenly across the tank. The last major waste type was aluminum cladding waste. These materials would be high in aluminum and silica; however, the solids volume is unknown because the majority of the solids would be deposited in the first tank to receive the wastes, which was not tank 241-C-112. The grey/white solids seen in the video recordings of the

core extrusions are believed to be cladding waste; the tan/dark brown solids are thought to be ferrocyanide sludge. Their observed position during extrusion agrees with the historical record. The volume of strontium semiworks waste was small and probably would not have been visually detectable. However, it would have a relatively high ^{90}Sr content because it includes strontium recovery and purification waste losses. This characteristic would be readily observable in the radiochemistry analyses.

6.2 REVIEW OF THE SUBSEGMENT ANALYTE PROFILES

The following conclusions are drawn from review of the subsegment analyses presented in Section 5.0.

Core 34

Chemical analyses indicate this material is ferrocyanide waste. The relatively high nickel, calcium, TOC, and ^{137}Cs support this conclusion. In addition, the total cyanide analysis indicates residual cyanide in the waste. The DSC traces show a small exotherm in the same temperature range where the In Farm simulants begin to show reactions; however, the overall energy release is somewhat lower than expected for the measured cyanide concentration and much lower than that expected from simulant information. The high uranium value in subsegment 2D is believed to be due to some UR waste also being present.

Core 35

The only solids recovered from this core were 7.6 cm (3.0 in.) of solids from the lower segment (assumed to be subsegment 2D); thus, the waste origin is indeterminate. Some analytes (e.g., nickel, aluminum, calcium, and phosphate), match Core 34 well. Other analytes such as nitrate, nitrite, uranium, and TOC/total carbon values agree better with Core 36. No total cyanide measurements are available.

Core 36

Subsegments 1C and 1D show high nickel, calcium, TOC, and ^{137}Cs analyte concentrations characteristic of ferrocyanide wastes. Subsegments 2C and 2D are relatively low in these analytes but high in uranium and phosphate, which is typical of UR wastes. The 2A and 2B subsegments appear to be a mix of these two types of waste. The total cyanide values trend generally lower as a function of waste depth. In subsegments 1C, 1D, 2A, and 2B, the DSC traces show a small exotherm in the same temperature range where the simulants show reactions; again the exotherms were much lower than expected. Although some measurable cyanide is in the lower subsegments, no corresponding exotherm is recorded in the DSC measurements. High TOC and ^{90}Sr values in 36-1C may indicate hot semiworks/strontium semiworks, which would have had organic complexants.

6.2.1 Tank Entrance/Exit Effects on Analyte Distribution

Figure 6-1 shows an elevation and plan of where the core samples were taken. Important items to note are that Core 36 (and 35) were taken from risers near the ferrocyanide waste inlet, while Core 34 was obtained near the waste pumpout riser. The decant "float and flex" pump contained a 6.1-m (20-ft) section of flexible hose that could traverse a relatively wide area on that side of the tank. The cascade fill line (where BiPO_4 waste entered the tank) is closer to the Core 34 sample point than to the Core 35 and 36 risers. The elevation view shows this is a shallow-dish bottom tank and the bottom of the core samples were 33 cm (13.0 in.) above the centerline inside bottom of the tank. Also shown is the waste surface, measured from the centerline as 115.1 ± 1.3 cm (45.3 ± 0.5 in.). The total sample and solids recovery for each of the three cores is shown as well as the top and bottom of the sample segments. If the solids recovery in the bottom of segment Core 34, is adjusted to equal Core 36, there is a 18.3-cm (7.2-in.) decrease in the top solids surface going from riser 8 across the tank to riser 2 (18.3-cm [7.2-in.] decrease in approximately 20.1 m [66 ft]). Figures 6-2A and 6-2B shows a representation of the overall waste profile of tank 241-C-112 and the assumed volumes, boundaries, and positions of the various individual layers as they are believed to exist.

As new wastes entered the tank and distributed themselves across the tank, the material under and around the tank pumpout (Core 34) would be routinely disturbed (and occasionally solids transferred) in behavior akin to the last in-first out principle. However, the material beneath the waste inlet (Cores 35 and 36) would be disturbed initially but, over time, large stratified layers resistant to mixing would eventually build up. Thus the influence of the waste inlet and outlet locations provides insight to the contrast in the analyte and waste profiles between Cores 34 and 36.

The ^{137}Cs concentrations are nearly uniform in the core composites. However, the ^{137}Cs concentration as a function of depth shows profiles consistent with the wastes believed to be associated with the subsegments--low ^{137}Cs values for unscavenged UR wastes, higher ^{137}Cs values for ferrocyanide wastes. In addition, the ^{137}Cs profile was relatively uniform in Core 34; it shows a decreasing trend as a function of depth in Core 36. The ^{90}Sr concentration, however, shows a highly skewed distribution between Cores 34 and 36 and unusual concentration profiles as a function of depth for both cores. Core 34 has extremely high ^{90}Sr concentration throughout; Core 36 is high in the top subsegment and then the concentration falls dramatically. The consistently high ^{90}Sr values in Core 34 are believed to be a localized phenomenon and not representative of the ^{90}Sr concentration in the tank. This observation is supported by heat-load estimates developed from thermal models of the temperature profiles in the tank. In addition, no mechanism has been demonstrated that has the capability to concentrate radionuclides to levels of concern (Dickinson et al. 1993). The temperature profile model results give a heat load of 2.37 ± 0.06 kW (Appendix C). A preliminary heat-load estimate developed from the Core 34 cesium and strontium inventories representing the bulk analyte concentrations is 5.63 kW. This value is not realistic, given the temperature measurements of the tank waste. Another preliminary estimate, calculated from Core 36 values (2.33 kW), is much more in agreement with the

Figure 6-1. Elevation and Plan of Tank 241-C-112.







Figure 6-2A. Waste Profile of Tank 241-C-112.



- Dished Bottom: First cycle BiPO_4 waste or unscavenged uranium recovery (UR) waste 57,700 L (15,000 gal)
- Tank Layer 1: Unscavenged UR waste 37,100 L (9,800 gal)
- Tank Layer 2: Unscavenged UR waste and ferrocyanide scavenging waste 37,100 L (9,800 gal)
- Tank Layer 3: Ferrocyanide scavenging waste 158,000 L (41,800 gal)
- Supernatant: 137,000 L (36,300 gal).

Figure 6-2B. Alternative Waste Profile of Tank 241-C-112.



- Dished Bottom: First cycle BiPO_4 waste or unscavenged uranium recovery (UR) waste 57,700 L (15,000 gal)
- Tank Layer 1: Unscavenged UR waste 74,200 L (19,600 gal)
- Tank Layer 2: Unscavenged UR waste and ferrocyanide scavenging waste 37,100 L (9,800 gal)
- Tank Layer 3: Ferrocyanide scavenging waste 158,000 L (41,800 gal)
- Tank Layer 4: Miscellaneous waste residues (CW, HS) 49,200 L (13,000 gal)
- Supernatant: 37,500 L (9,900 gal).

heat-load model value for tank 241-C-112. Core 35 does not have enough waste to provide a basis for a meaningful comparison. Using the model heat load as a basis, a realistic ^{90}Sr concentration/inventory may be developed. This will be shown in Section 6.3. The high localized ^{90}Sr values may be attributable to the location of the core samples relative to the waste inlet and outlet.

One of the upper subsegments of Core 36 (36-1C) was relatively high in aluminum, which is typical for cladding wastes that were deposited on top of the ferrocyanide wastes. Aluminum shows similar distribution behavior to ^{90}Sr ; a high and relatively uniform concentration in Core 34, and in Core 36, a much lower concentration that decreases as a function of depth. This may be reasonable because the same tank conditions and disturbances would have affected later waste transfers. As noted previously (Borsheim and Simpson 1991), some large transfers from tank 241-C-112 in the 1970's probably transferred some of the uppermost solids from the tank. None of the core sample subsegments demonstrated convincing evidence of being 1C waste solids. Unfortunately, the bismuth values that distinguish this waste were not determined via the ICP fusion analysis. It is expected that the bulk of the BiPO_4 1C waste lies below the depth that can be core sampled through the available risers.

6.2.2 Comparisons with the Borsheim/Simpson Model Estimates

Calculations of the ^{137}Cs , nickel, and $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$ inventories are analytes appropriate for comparison with the model. Assumptions regarding the tank used in the calculations for the analytical estimates, and the calculations themselves, are presented in Appendix A. Table 6-1 presents comparisons of the calculated values with the original and revised Borsheim/Simpson values after scavenging was finished.

Table 6-1. Comparisons of Initial and Revised Borsheim/Simpson Model Estimates with Values Calculated from Analytical Results

Analyte	Borsheim/Simpson		Revised Borsheim/Simpson		Analytical Estimates (from Section 6.3)
	Retained	Input	1.0 (retained) vol%	1.5 (retained) vol%	
Ni, moles	31,000	78,500	98,800 ¹	93,300 ¹	95,200
^{137}Cs , kCi (decayed to 1993)	124.8	334.8	224.7	205.9	217.2
$\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$, moles	31,000	78,500	65,900	60,400	8,700

¹Includes the ^{60}Co scavenging contribution.

Several assumptions must be made to calculate the tank contents before making comparisons to the Borsheim/Simpson model predictions for selected analytes. In addition, several assumptions of that model must be examined because they affect the original predictions regarding the waste in the tanks, such as (1) the assumption of 4.25 vol% solids formation (representative of the U Plant materials, not the In Farm waste); (2) no additional settling or compaction; (3) negligible waste transfer (input/output) effects; and (4) transfers after the scavenging program did not meaningfully affect the condition of the waste. However, at the time they were obtained, these data and assumptions were the best available. As the ferrocyanide program evolved, more and better data became available.

The development of the model provided some preliminary understanding to the condition and distribution of the waste in the tank. Generally, the model gave values that were within $\pm 50\%$ of the values calculated from the analytical results. Where agreement was not good, further investigation found reasonable sources for the difference. The range of values developed from the model was adequate for defining initial conditions (and bounding values); however, for analytes like ^{90}Sr and ferrocyanide itself, further process history contributed meaningfully to the present inventory in the tank as determined from laboratory analysis. Further clarification was provided by physical and chemical characterization of flowsheet materials, as well as aging and energetics studies. The model functioned well within the constraints placed on its operation, and it remains flexible enough to run further trials with new parameters, which have been done and are presented in Appendix A.

As noted previously, the analytical nickel values are biased high, perhaps as much as 20 to 25 percent, by the use of a nickel crucible in the ICP fusion assay. Because the nickel tracer is biased high and it is unknown how much of the ferrocyanide solids were actually transported to the cribs, initial agreement is not good between the model estimates and the analytical results. In addition, ^{60}Co scavenging was done in several of the batches that were settled in tank 241-C-112, adding to the nickel inventory but not contributing to the ferrocyanide content. Approximately 32,900 g-mol of additional nickel was added to the tank in these process runs. Therefore, the nickel inventory determined from Borsheim/Simpson should be adjusted upwards by that amount to account for the additional nickel; the model only accounted for nickel deposited with ferrocyanide. Agreement between the model values and the analysis-based estimates closes when the analytical bias is considered and with inventory adjustments from the cobalt-scavenging contribution. However, with all of the caveats associated with it, the nickel assay provides no more than a bounding condition for the ferrocyanide inventory as well as indicating that ferrocyanide was (or is) present.

Values for ^{137}Cs from Borsheim/Simpson adequately bound the inventories calculated from the analytical results. The calculated inventory can vary somewhat depending on the which core's density and concentration values are used in the computation. No overt biases were found in the analysis, and no other waste type that was disposed to tank 241-C-112 is believed to have a ^{137}Cs concentration high enough to confound inventory estimates (unlike ^{90}Sr). In addition, ^{137}Cs values provide a potential check on the waste retention of the tank. Cesium was widely dispersed in the slurry while it was settling,

and its concentration profile as a function of depth is relatively uniform in the subsegments believed to be ferrocyanide waste. The Borsheim/Simpson model has a significant amount of solids disposed to the cribs as a result of some of the model assumptions. If the ^{137}Cs values are used to estimate the waste retention in the tank, the amount of ferrocyanide waste retained in the tank is much higher than the estimated 40 percent retention from present model values.

A large degree of uncertainty is associated with the amount of ferrocyanide waste that may have been disposed to the cribs. The original model run has a large amount of solids being discharged, even though the available records indicate that the discharged effluent had only traces of suspended solids in it. The model basis of 4.25 vol% has been determined to be flawed for this waste type. Simulant studies indicate that an appropriate solids formation value for the In Farm process is 1.0 to 1.5 vol% (Jeppson and Wong 1993). This additional information can be used to develop better model parameters and waste inventory estimates. A rerun of the model using these new volume parameters gives significantly better agreement.

The ferrocyanide inventory calculated from the total cyanide analysis ranges between 8,700 to 11,500 g-mol. The revised model value for the estimated remaining ferrocyanide of 60,000 to 66,000 g-mol is significantly higher than that determined from experimental results. The model estimated the total ferrocyanide used in processing waste through tank 241-C-112 is 78,500 g-mol. Given the improvement in agreement of the other analytes, this result, along with the energetic results, suggests a degradation or aging mechanism of some type.

6.3 CALCULATED BULK INVENTORIES OF SELECTED ANALYTES

Two different interpretations of the waste distribution in the tank were evaluated. The major difference in the two interpretations is the distribution of mass between supernate and wet solids. The second interpretation increases the mass of wet solids by approximately 30%, and the inventory relationship is linear for nearly all of the analytes (i.e., most of them increase by about 30%). The proportional contributions of each of the major analytes remain almost unchanged. The rationale for two interpretations of the tank conditions come from core recovery data and reviewing the in-tank photographs. The first interpretation, based on core recovery data, interpreted a significant amount of standing liquid remaining in the tank, and that the waste in the tank had a significant spatial bias (tilt) from the waste heel and input/output effects. The second interpretation was based on the in-tank photographs. The waste surface appears littered with debris and seems relatively solid; there is little standing liquid. Several liquid pools are observed and seem to be quite deep, some of them are located near the risers. The debris observed are potential obstructions to core sampling and may be the cause of poor sample recovery encountered in some of the samples. The waste surface appears wet, but solid, pocked with pools of liquid. However, this appearance may be deceiving--it could be a surface scum or a quicksand-like material.

Several safety issues are defined by certain bulk amounts or weight percent of a given analyte. Tables 6-2 through 6-5 present the calculated

bulk amounts of some selected analytes and their weight percent contribution to the waste matrix in the first interpretation. Tables 6-6 through 6-9 present the same information for the 2nd interpretation. The gross waste inventory in the tank is estimated to range between 608,000 and 610,000 kg (434,000 kg wet solid, and 174,000 kg of drainable liquid in the first case; 563,000 kg wet solid and 47,800 kg of drainable liquid in the second case). Appendix A presents the data, assumptions, and calculations used to determine the following values. Values presented as concentration estimates and used in bulk inventory calculations are generally within the 95% confidence interval and relative percent difference between sample and duplicate are usually less than 20%. However, given the heterogeneous nature of the tank waste, the degree of stratification in the tank, and the potential bias introduced from incomplete sample recovery, these values could be skewed by as much as 50% in some cases. In some cases, independent data can be used to verify or bound several of the presented values.

First Interpretation: (refer to Figure 6-2A)

Table 6-2. Energetics Related Analyte Values.

	TOC	Total Cyanide	NO ₂ ⁻	NO ₃ ⁻	H ₂ O
Bulk Inventory (Mg)	1.86	1.55	27.78	37.32	355.37 ¹
Wt% (total)	0.31	0.25	4.57	6.14	58.42 ¹
Bulk Inventory, wet solids (Mg)	1.56	1.35	18.19	24.76	233.22
Wt% (wet solids)	0.36	0.31	4.19	5.71	53.77

¹Water content combines interstitial and free water (i.e., supernate).

TOC = Total organic carbon.

The bulk inventory of disodium nickel ferrocyanide in the tank is 8,700 g-mol, assuming the calculated inventory of total cyanide is present as that analyte. Molar ratios for ferrocyanide, nitrate, and nitrite in the wet solids (assuming this value for ferrocyanide) are 1: 45.4 : 45.9.

Table 6-3. Fission Product Inventory.

	¹³⁷ Cs	⁹⁰ Sr
Bulk Inventory (Ci) (wet solids)	217,200	183,500
Heat Generation (w)	1025	1230

The total heat load of the tank is 2,255. The volumetric heat generation for the waste in the tank based on the solids volume is 7.8 E-3 w/L solids at 1.50 g/mL.

Table 6-4. Plutonium/Americium Inventory.

	^{238}Pu	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$	^{241}Am
Bulk Inventory (Ci) (wet solids)	5.9	67.3	330
Bulk Inventory (g)	0.34	1,100	100

Table 6-5. ICP Major Cation Inventory (Fusion Preparation).

	Al	Ca	Fe	Na	Ni	P	U
Bulk Inventory (Mg)	4.34	6.08	8.38	40.12	5.52	10.08	22.09
Wt% (Wet solids)	1.00	1.40	1.93	9.25	1.27	2.32	5.09

Second Interpretation: (refer to Figure 6-2B)

Table 6-6. Energetics Related Analyte Values.

	TOC	Total Cyanide	NO_2^-	NO_3^-	H_2O
Bulk Inventory (Mg)	2.08	1.85	26.23	35.60	327.01 ¹
Wt% (total)	0.34	0.30	4.29	5.83	53.54
Bulk Inventory, wet solids (Mg)	2.00	1.80	23.61	32.17	293.70
Wt% (wet solids)	0.35	0.32	4.19	5.71	52.15

¹Water content combines interstitial and free water (i.e., supernate).

TOC = Total organic carbon.

The bulk inventory of disodium nickel ferrocyanide in the tank is 11,500 g-mol, assuming the calculated inventory of total cyanide is present as that analyte. Molar ratios for ferrocyanide, nitrate, and nitrite in the wet solids (assuming this value for ferrocyanide) are 1: 44.6 : 45.1.

Table 6-7. Fission Product Inventory.

	^{137}Cs	^{90}Sr
Bulk Inventory (Ci) (wet solids)	286,000	162,000
Heat Generation (w)	1,350	1,030

The total heat load of the tank is 2,440. The volumetric heat generation for the waste in the tank based on the solids volume is 6.5 E-3 w/L solids at 1.50 g/mL.

Table 6-8. Plutonium/Americium Inventory.

	^{238}Pu	$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$	^{241}Am
Bulk Inventory (Ci) (wet solids)	7.7	87.1	430
Bulk Inventory (g)	0.44	1,400	125

Table 6-9. ICP Major Cation Inventory (Fusion Preparation).

	Al	Ca	Fe	Na	Ni	P	U
Bulk Inventory (Mg)	5.50	8.98	10.50	52.31	7.15	13.76	28.10
Wt% (Wet solids)	0.98	1.59	1.87	9.29	1.27	2.44	4.99

6.4 GAMMA SCANNING OF CORE SAMPLE SEGMENTS

Qualitative measurements of the gamma emitters in the waste were obtained. The information, although interesting and somewhat useful, was not as comprehensive as was hoped and could have been obtained at less cost through a lower technology method or simply by waiting for extrusion and analysis of the sample. The scans showed that radiocesium is the only significant gamma emitter in the waste. After evaluation of the data results from the gamma scans from tank 241-C-112, a decision was made to suspend any further gamma scanning on the remaining ferrocyanide tanks until hard salt cake samples (e.g. tank 241-BY-104) can be obtained. This decision was made on several bases; however the most significant factor was cost.

The information from the scan was also found to be an accurate indicator of core condition (i.e., full, partial, or empty) and it did confirm that there was some gross layering of the wastes, in addition to differences in activity between batches. This information is of some value because it allows modifications to the analysis plan prior to extrusion, if necessary, avoiding hot cell delays. Thus, field radiography is under consideration as a procedure to indicate percent recovery. The information regarding layering and variations batch content is also somewhat valuable; however, now that the hypothesis has been tentatively confirmed, the analytical horizons in the characterization plan for core sample analysis are now believed narrow enough to find ferrocyanide and ^{137}Cs concentrations.

Based on the information obtained from these initial scans, the cost associated with this analytical technique was not thought to be good value and drained resources from the program. Investigation of tank 241-BY-104 core samples (salt cake and sludge) is the next gamma scanning effort under consideration. Those core samples differ enough in composition and process history for the technique to be of potential value.

In addition to the cost-benefit argument, PNL raised objections to continuing the gamma scanning effort because of the schedule delays caused by logistical problems in sample transport between the various facilities and hot cell scheduling. Given the limited sample transport, limited hot cell and personnel resources, and the uncertainty regarding the availability of these resources at any given time, the schedule constraints regarding data package delivery also became major considerations in discontinuing the effort.

This page intentionally left blank.

7.0 QUANTITATIVE/STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This section contains the statistical analysis of core samples taken from tank 241-C-112. The analysis is divided into four sections. The first section contains mean concentration estimates in the form of confidence intervals for each analyte of interest. Second, an examination of samples taken at two locations from homogenized subsegments was conducted to determine the ability of the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to homogenize solid core segments. The results from this examination indicate that the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory is able to homogenize core subsegments satisfactorily. The third section is a comparison of the core composite concentration estimates with a simulated core composite computed from individual subsegment data. In 89 percent of the cases tested, the core composite could not be statistically distinguished from the simulated core composite. This indicates that the ability of the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to make core composites is satisfactory. The last topic in this section addresses the issue of spatial (between core) variability and analytical error. Variance component estimates and confidence intervals are presented and discussed. In general, the spatial variability is of the same magnitude or larger than the analytical error.

Samples were obtained for subsegments 1D, 2B, 2C, and 2D from Core 34; a single subsegment, 2D, from Core 35; and subsegments 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D from Core 36. Drainable liquids were recovered from Cores 34 and 35. Composite samples were made from the homogenized subsegment samples for each core. It should be noted that the Core 35 composite and subsegment 2D are one and the same. Drainable liquid composites were also made for Cores 34 and 35. A sample and duplicate were taken from each core composite and prepared for analysis in the laboratory. Laboratory analyses were conducted on additional homogenized subsegment samples for the homogenization tests.

The laboratory results from tank 241-C-112 samples are tabulated in Appendix B. Sample preparations, assays, and analytes chosen for statistical evaluation are as follows: ICP acid digestion, ICP potassium hydroxide fusion dissolution, and ICP water leach analyses were conducted on all core composite samples and duplicates for aluminum, calcium, iron, sodium, nickel, lead, uranium, and phosphorous. Core 34 composite duplicate analysis results were not reported for ICP potassium hydroxide fusion dissolution and ICP water leach methods. The potassium hydroxide/nickel fusion dissolution was the only ICP method used to analyze subsegment results. Radiochemistry composite sample results were reported for uranium, ^{238}Pu , $^{239/240}\text{Pu}$, ^{137}Cs , and ^{90}Sr , as well as subsegment results for ^{137}Cs and ^{90}Sr . Ion Chromatography analysis results for chloride, nitrite, nitrate, phosphate, and sulfate were reported for core composite and subsegment samples. The ICP acid digestion analysis results were used to evaluate the homogenization test samples. Figures for the homogenization test data are also found in Appendix B. Drainable liquids were recovered from Cores 34 and 35. They are included in part of the analysis and results for concentration estimates.

7.1 CONCENTRATION ESTIMATES

A task directed by WHC-EP-0210 to tank 241-C-112 was to estimate the constituent concentrations (Hill et al. 1991). This task was accomplished using means and appropriate confidence intervals (CI) on these means. It should be emphasized that concentration estimates will be obtained rather than an inventory of the tank.

Each segment was subdivided into subsegments. The subsegments were each homogenized (laboratory core homogenization ability is covered in Section 4.0). Each core composite was formed by combining samples from the homogenized subsegments. The core composite sample was then also homogenized. Two aliquots were drawn from each core composite and prepared for chemical analysis. Concentration estimates were computed based on the results of these chemical analyses. Appendix B contains the core composite data used to obtain concentration estimates and intervals. The "NA" symbol indicates that the data is not available.

The concentration estimates are given in the form of 95 percent CIs on the mean concentration of each analyte in the tank. It is assumed that each sample and duplicate are analyzed independent of one another to yield adequate estimates of analytical error. Due to the hierarchical structure of the data, the analytical error alone is not the appropriate error term to use in the CI calculations. A linear combination of the analytical error and spatial variability is the appropriate measure of spread for the CIs. The derivation of the formulas used to calculate these CIs is given in a Westinghouse Hanford Company internal memo (Jensen and Whitcher 1993).

Tables 7-1, 7-2, 7-3, 7-4, and 7-5 contain the following summary statistics for all three ICP analyses (acid digestion, water leach, potassium hydroxide/nickel fusion dissolution), radiochemistry, and IC anion analyses, respectively.

For some analytes the lower confidence limit L was negative. Because concentrations are strictly greater than or equal to zero, any negative L values were set to zero.

The drainable liquid composites (DLC) were added to the solid composite data to increase the information and, therefore, give more accurate CIs. Some of the DLC results from the ICP acid digestion analysis are quite different from the solid core composite results. For this reason two sets of summary statistics on all core composite results are presented, one including and another set excluding the DLC results. Plutonium, uranium, nickel, calcium, and iron DLC results are quite different than the solid core composite data. These differences will inflate the analytical error, which is a component in σ_y^2 for the CI. The DLCs do not create a problem for ICP acid digestion sodium analysis or any of the ICP water leach analyses.

A close examination of the ICP water leach sodium results revealed a large residual associated with one of the Core 36 composite result of 130,962 $\mu\text{g/g}$. Its duplicate result was 85,753 $\mu\text{g/g}$, which is within the range of the other core composite results. Additional summary statistics are given excluding this outlying result.

Table 7-1. Acid Digestion Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$).

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
Al	24,464	7.65 E+08	1.28 E+08	2	0	73,056
Ca	16,743	5.12 E+07	8.53 E+06	2	4,179	29,307
Fe	21,853	2.63 E+07	4.40 E+06	2	12,836	30,871
Na	89,567	5.57 E+08	9.30 E+07	2	48,115	131,018
Ni	13,113	3.20 E+07	5.33 E+06	2	3,179	23,047
Pb	2,553	4.59 E+06	7.64 E+05	2	0	6,315
U	58,389	3.22 E+09	5.37 E+08	2	0	158,129
P	22,915	9.4 E+07	1.57 E+07	2	5,864	39,967
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
Al	24,464	7.65 E+08	1.28 E+08	2	0	73,056
Ca	10,189	8.35 E+07	8.34 E+06	2	0	22,621
Fe	13,473	5.28 E+07	5.27 E+06	2	3591	23,354
Na	84,235	7.71 E+08	7.71 E+07	2	46447	122,024
Ni	8,084	1.95 E+06	1.95 E+06	2	2078	14,089
Pb	2,553	4.59 E+06	7.64 E+05	2	0	6,315
U	35,446	4.05 E+09	4.05 E+08	2	0	122,048
P	15,283	3.02 E+08	3.02 E+07	2	0	38,949

\bar{y} : arithmetic mean of the concentration data,
 BMS: "between mean squares" from the one-way analysis of variance,
 $\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$: estimated variance of \bar{y} ,
 df: degrees of freedom associated with BMS,
 L: lower limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean, and
 U: upper limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean.

Table 7-2. Potassium Hydroxide Fusion Dissolution Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$).

Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
Al	26,540	7.53 E+08	1.51 E+08	2	0	79,337
Ca	19,950	6.56 E+07	1.31 E+07	2	4,367	35,533
Fe	27,915	3.62 E+07	7.23 E+06	2	16,344	39,486
Na	103,893	8.43 E+08	1.69 E+08	2	48,026	159,760
Ni	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pb	2,937	6.51 E+0	1.30 E+06	2	0	7,846
U	80,730	2.87 E+09	5.74 E+08	2	0	183,779
P	27,971	1.29 E+08	2.58 E+07	2	6,135	49,808

\bar{y} : arithmetic mean of the concentration data,
 BMS: "between mean squares" from the one-way analysis of variance,
 $\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$: estimated variance of \bar{y} ,
 df: degrees of freedom associated with BMS,
 L: lower limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean, and
 U: upper limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean.

Table 7-3. Water Leach Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$).

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
Al	521	1.43 E+05	2.87 E+04	2	0	1,250
Ca	338	7.04 E+03	1.41 E+03	2	176	499
Fe	1,168	3.66 E+05	7.31 E+04	2	5	2,332
Na	88,541	1.31 E+09	2.62 E+08	2	18,838	158,244
Na #						
Ni	679	1.38 E+05	2.76 E+04	2	0	1,395
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	2,166	9.87 E+06	1.97 E+06	2	0	8,211
P	10,108	6.72 E+07	1.34 E+07	2	0	25,886
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
Al	521	1.43 E+05	2.87 E+04	2	0	1,250
Ca	253	2.57 E+04	3.67 E+03	2	0	513
Fe	1,092	4.20 E+05	4.68 E+04	2	161	2,022
Na	84,078	1.34 E+09	1.49 E+08	2	31477	136,679
Na #						
Ni	662	1.65 E+05	1.84 E+04	2	79	1,245
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	1,673	1.11 E+07	1.23 E+06	2	0	6,442
P	7,350	1.07 E+08	1.18 E+07	2	0	22,153

excluding outlier data result.
 \bar{y} : arithmetic mean of the concentration data,
BMS: "between mean squares" from the one-way analysis of variance,
 $\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$: estimated variance of \bar{y} ,
df: degrees of freedom associated with BMS,
L: lower limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean
U: upper limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean.

Table 7-4. Radiochemistry Statistics ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$).

Element	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
^{137}Cs	747	8.38 E+03	1.68 E+03	2	571	924
^{90}Sr	2,189	4.74 E+06	9.48 E+05	2	0	6,380
$\text{U}_{\text{FL}} (\mu\text{g/g})$	68,600	3.89 E+09	1.30 E+09	1	0.0	525,911
$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$	0.06	0.013323	0.002665	2	0.0	0.28
^{238}Pu	0.06	0.025023	0.005005	2	0.00	0.37

FL = laser fluorimetry

Table 7-5. Ion Chromatography Anion Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$).

Compound	\bar{y}	BMS	$\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$	df	L	U
Chloride	980	109,000	21,800	2	345	1,615
Nitrite	47,200	2.99 E+08	5.98 E+07	2	13,930	80,470
Nitrate	62,000	5.95 E+08	1.19 E+08	2	15,080	108,921
Phosphate	30,760	5.86 E+08	1.17 E+08	2	0	77,337
Sulfate	12,040	2.09 E+07	4.19 E+06	2	3,237	20,843

\bar{y} : arithmetic mean of the concentration data,
 BMS: "between mean squares" from the one-way analysis of variance,
 $\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}^2$: estimated variance of \bar{y} ,
 df: degrees of freedom associated with BMS,
 L: lower limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean, and
 U: upper limit to the 95% confidence interval on the mean.

The radiochemistry U confidence limits should be viewed with caution. This interval is based on three sample results from Cores 34 and 36. The CI for \bar{y} uses a t-statistic with one degree of freedom, which inflates the CI width due to the uncertainty of the U results.

7.2 HOMOGENIZATION TESTS

A second task, directed by WHC-EP-0210 Rev 1 (Winters et al. 1990a) to core samples from tank 241-C-112, was to evaluate the ability of the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to homogenize core subsegments. Each subsegment (from Cores 34, 35, and 36) was homogenized and arbitrarily divided into two parts (top and bottom). One subsample was obtained from each part. Two aliquots were taken from each subsample and prepared for chemical analysis. The homogenization test data described above are tabulated in Appendix B. ICP acid digestion analyses were conducted on the aliquots for the following analytes: aluminum, iron, sodium, nickel, lead, uranium, and phosphorus.

Due to the structure of the data, a hierarchical model can be fit to the data. This model is used to separate different components of variability in the data. The total variability in the data is composed of three separate components: one due to variability between the segments; one due to the variability between samples from the homogenized material (σ_h^2) within the segments (this component of variability is referred to as being due to homogenization); and one due to analytical error. The analytical error is the variance component that measures the variability between duplicate measurements from aliquots prepared from the same sample. Appendix B contains a description of the hierarchical model. From the analysis of variance (ANOVA) results of the hierarchical model, a test can be conducted to determine if σ_h^2 is significantly greater than zero. If σ_h^2 is significantly greater than zero, then it can be concluded that the laboratory does not have the ability to homogenize core segments. If it cannot be concluded that σ_h^2 is significantly greater than zero, then the laboratory does have the ability to homogenize core segments. The F-statistic p-value from the ANOVA was used to test if σ_h^2 is greater than zero. If the p-value is smaller than 0.05, it is concluded that the $\sigma_h^2 > 0$.

The results of the homogenization test are given in Table 7-6. For all analytes tested (aluminum, calcium, iron, sodium, nickel, phosphorus, lead, uranium), the p-value from the F-test was greater than 0.05. It cannot be concluded that the variability between the sampled locations of the mixed subsegments is significantly different from zero. The overall conclusion is that the ability of the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to homogenize core samples is satisfactory for this material. It is interesting to note that segment-to-segment variability always accounts for more than 77 percent of the total variability, and analytical error claims most of the rest. The percent of the variability due to the homogenization is usually less than 1 percent.

Table 7-6. Homogenization Test Results.

Analyte	p-value	% Variability due to:		
		segment	homogenization	analytical
Al	0.65	94.82	0.00	5.18
Ca	0.10	99.45	0.34	0.21
Fe	0.58	77.10	0.00	22.90
Na	0.72	92.95	0.00	7.05
Ni	0.42	99.17	0.04	0.79
P	0.26	96.55	0.74	2.71
Pb	0.22	99.73	0.87	2.40
U	0.08	99.55	0.21	0.24

An observation with a large residual was found for Core 34, subsegment 2D iron data. The removal of this observation did not change the results of the homogenization tests.

7.3 COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SIMULATED CORE COMPOSITE AND THE CORE COMPOSITE

Another task directed by WHC-EP-0210 (Winters et al. 1990a,b) was to evaluate the ability of the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to prepare core composite samples from the individual subsegment samples. A core composite sample was formed by combining equally weighted individual samples from each homogenized subsegment in the core. The core composite was then homogenized and a sample and duplicate were taken. A simulated core composite was constructed to compare with the core composite samples. The simulated core composite is the mean of the results from the chemical analysis of the individual aliquots from each segment.

For the chemical analysis methods reporting subsegment results (ICP potassium hydroxide fusion dissolution, radiochemistry, IC), Core 34 did not have core composite duplicate results reported. For this reason, the method used to compare the core composite with the simulated core composite for Core 36 is slightly different than the method used for Core 34.

7.3.1 Core 36 Statistical Methods

The comparison for Core 36 is made by computing a CI on the difference between the two means. If zero is in the CI, the simulated core composite mean cannot be statistically distinguished from the core composite sample mean. If zero is not in the CI, the two means are significantly different.

The CI on the difference between the simulated core composite and core composite mean is (L, U), where the lower (L) and (U) values are

$$L = (\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c) - t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)}, \quad U = (\bar{y}_w + \bar{y}_c) - t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)}$$

and where

- \bar{y}_w : subsegment data mean (simulated core composite)
- \bar{y}_c : core composite sample mean
- t: 97.5 percentile point from Student's t distribution
- $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$: estimated variance of the difference.

Appendix B contains a discussion on how $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$ is calculated. The calculation of $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$ uses the data from all three cores because of the limited data available. The "t" has degrees of freedom (df) associated with it, which was calculated using Satterwaite's approximation (Snedecor and Cochran 1980).

7.3.2 Core 34 Statistical Methods

A CI for \bar{y}_w is calculated to make the comparison between the core composite and the simulated core composite. If the composite sample result is contained within the CI, then \bar{y}_w cannot be statistically distinguished from the core composite sample result. If the core composite sample results are not contained within the CI, then \bar{y}_w and the core composite sample are statistically different.

The CI on \bar{y}_w is (L, U) where the lower (L) and (U) values are

$$L = \bar{y}_w - t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)}, \quad U = \bar{y}_w + t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)}$$

and where $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)$ is the estimated variance of \bar{y}_w . Appendix B contains a discussion of how $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)$ is calculated.

7.3.3 Results from Cores 34 and 36

Tables 7-7 and 7-8 present the results of the simulated core composites mean versus the core composite mean for Cores 34 and 36 respectively. Appendix B contains figures of the segment and core composite data for all three cores, which may aid in the understanding the results from the tables.

Only three analytes (sodium, chloride, sulfate) had composite samples that were outside of the \bar{y}_w confidence interval for Core 34. In all three cases, the composite sample exceeds the upper limit of the CI. For Core 36, all the CIs of the difference $\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c$ contained zero, indicating that there was no significant difference between \bar{y}_w and \bar{y}_c . Overall, the simulated core composite could be statistically distinguished from the mean in 89 percent of the cases tested. On this basis, it can be concluded that the 325 Analytical Chemistry Laboratory is able to make core composites satisfactorily.

7.4 SPATIAL VARIABILITY AND ANALYTICAL ERROR ESTIMATION

Using the hierarchical structure of the data (cores selected randomly and two aliquots selected per core composite), the spatial variability and the analytical error can be separated from each other. The spatial variability is the variability from core composite to core composite. The analytical error, as it is called here, is not only true analytical error. Confounded with it is segment homogenization and sampling variability. Variability from all three of these sources will be referred to as analytical error.

The size of the analytical error compared to the spatial variability has an impact on the analyte concentration CIs from Section 3.0. The variance used in the CI calculations is a linear function of estimates of spatial and analytical variability. Because the size of the analytical error can potentially be controlled, this comparison is an interesting factor.

Table 7-7. Segment vs. Composite Statistics for Core 34.

Analyte	\bar{y}_w	$\sigma^2(\bar{y}_w)$	Composite	df*	95% CI for \bar{y}_w	
					L	U
Al	23,549	5.24 E+07	29,798	2	0	54,708
Ca	25,894	1.89 E+07	28,984	8	15,864	35,923
Fe	13,295	1.95 E+07	22,848	8	3,107	23,483
Na #	87,128	1.35 E+07	114,891	9	78,806	95,451
Pb	3,220	1.10 E+06	3,326	3	0	6,559
U	20,098	6.98 E+08	14,369	5	0	88,039
P	17,318	6.50 E+06	21,956	6	11,076	23,561
Chloride #	963	4,464	1,300	6	799	1,126
Nitrite	51,875	1.88 E+07	62,000	5	40,740	63,010
Nitrate	68,125	2.80 E+07	80,000	5	54,528	81,722
Phosphate	13,200	3.37 E+07	19,100	7	0	26,922
Sulfate #	12,587	8.57 E+05	15,600	6	10,322	14,852
Cs-137	539	17,666	750	9	238	840
Sr-90	2,456	5.37 E+05	3,510	4	422	4,490

Significant difference between segment data and composite.

units: $\mu\text{g/g}$: Al, Ca, Fe, Na, Pb, U, P, chloride, nitrite, nitrate, phosphate, sulfate

$\mu\text{Ci/g}$: Cs-137, Sr-90

Table 7-8. Segment vs. Composite Statistics for Core 36.

Analyte	\bar{y}_w	\bar{y}_c	$\sigma^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$	df*	95% CI for $\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c$	
					L	U
Al	4,948	6,410	4.29 E+08	3	-67,364	64,439
Ca	15,484	20,391	5.17 E+07	5	-23,393	13,580
Fe	18,355	26,012	3.76 E+07	7	-22,158	6,844
Na	92,724	120,730	4.35 E+08	2	-117,756	61,744
Pb	1,788	1,049	4.36 E+06	3	-5,902	7,379
U	96,380	104,910	2.13 E+09	4	-136,748	119,688
P	24,733	36,761	7.10 E+07	2	-48,288	24,232
Chloride	783	1,050	58,964	2	-1,312	778
Nitrite	40,750	52,500	1.68 E+08	3	-53,025	29,525
Nitrate	55,667	71,500	3.25 E+08	2	-93,463	61,796
Phosphate	28,858	49,500	3.27 E+08	2	-98,414	57,130
Sulfate	10,600	13,700	1.13 E+07	2	-17,578	11,377
Cs-137	559	793	21,857	11	-559	92
Sr-90	384	508	2.90 E+06	3	-7,462	7,214

significant difference between segment data and composite

units: $\mu\text{g/g}$: Al, Ca, Fe, Na, Pb, U, P, chloride, nitrite, nitrate, phosphate, sulfate $\mu\text{Ci/g}$: Cs-137, Sr-90

Estimates of the spatial variability ($\hat{\sigma}_s^2$) and analytical error ($\hat{\sigma}_a^2$) were obtained for each analyte by solving a system of equations using ANOVA results and expected mean squares (Snedecor and Cochran 1980). Snedecor and Cochran (1980) also explain how CIs for σ_s^2 and σ_a^2 were obtained. An approximate CI for σ_s^2 was obtained using the ANOVA results and four F-statistic values. Exact CIs were obtained for σ_s^2 using $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ and a chi-square statistic. Tables 7-9, 7-10, 7-11, 7-12, and 7-13 contain estimates and 95 percent CIs for σ_s^2 and σ_a^2 for all 14 analytes and chemical analysis methods. Using the variance component estimation methods described above, it is possible to obtain negative estimates. When negative variance components estimates were obtained they were set equal to zero. Lower limits (L) on the 95 percent CIs were also set equal to zero if they were negative.

Including or excluding the DLC results greatly affected $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$ for the acid digestion and water leach ICP analyses (refer to Tables 7-9 and 7-10). When the DLCs were excluded, $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ was generally larger than $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$. When the DLCs were included, $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ was generally of the same magnitude or larger than $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$. For the radiochemistry analysis, an estimate and approximate CI for σ_s^2 were not obtained due to the small number of data reported.

In general, the upper limits (U) on the approximate 95 percent CIs for σ_s^2 were larger than the 95 percent CI upper limits for σ_a^2 (88 percent of the cases). From this result it can be generally concluded that the spatial variability (σ_s^2) is of the same magnitude or larger than the analytical error σ_a^2 .

Table 7-9. Acid Digestion Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates.

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	$\hat{\sigma}_s^2$	$\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ *		95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	
			L	U	L	U
Al	3.67 E+08	3.10 E+07	9.69 E+07	7.44 E+09	9.93 E+06	4.30 E+08
Ca	2.49 E+07	1.44 E+06	7.11 E+06	4.98 E+08	4.62 E+05	1.20 E+07
Fe	0	2.76 E+07	0	2.43 E+08	8.85 E+06	3.83 E+08
Na	2.66 E+08	2.39 E+07	6.91 E+07	5.42 E+09	7.66 E+06	3.32 E+08
Ni	1.55 E+07	1.06 E+06	4.28 E+06	3.11 E+08	3.41 E+05	1.48 E+07
Pb	2.28 E+06	24,113	7.43 E+05	4.47 E+07	7,737	3.35 E+05
U	1.56 E+09	1.10 E+08	4.28 E+08	3.14 E+10	3.54 E+07	1.53 E+09
P	4.52 E+07	3.83 E+06	1.19 E+07	9.17 E+08	1.23 E+06	5.32 E+07
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	$\hat{\sigma}_s^2$	$\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ *		95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	
			L	U	L	U
Al	3.67 E+08	3.10 E+07	9.69 E+07	7.44 E+09	9.93 E+06	4.30 E+08
Ca	12,440	8.34 E+07	0	4.82 E+08	3.65 E+07	3.46 E+08
Fe	0	1.55 E+08	0	2.73 E+08	6.77 E+07	6.41 E+08
Na	2.31 E+08	3.28 E+07	4.63 E+07	4.69 E+09	1.43 E+07	1.36 E+08
Ni	0	5.82 E+07	0	1.00 E+08	2.55 E+07	2.41 E+08
Pb	2.28 E+06	24,112	7.43 E+05	4.47 E+07	7,736.657	3.35 E+05
U	9.72 E+08	9.39 E+08	0	2.44 E+10	4.11 E+08	3.89 E+09
P	7.36 E+07	6.70 E+07	0	1.82 E+09	2.93 E+07	2.77 E+08

*Approximate 95% confidence interval (CI).

Table 7-10. Water Leach Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates.

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	$\hat{\sigma}_s^2$	$\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ *		95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	
			L	U	L	U
Al	70,595	30,458	0	1.73 E+06	8,254	120,388
Ca	0	37,798	0	61,606	10,243	149,400
Fe	2.26 E+05	3,433	7.28 E+04	4.45 E+06	930	13,569
Na	5.01 E+08	5.11 E+08	0	1.57 E+10	1.38 E+08	2.02 E+09
Ni	85,597	1,287	2.76 E+04	1.68 E+06	349	5,087
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	4.55 E+06	2.60 E+06	0	1.19 E+08	7.03 E+05	1.03 E+07
P	3.50 E+07	1.13 E+07	2.27 E+06	8.12 E+08	3.06 E+06	4.46 E+07
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	$\hat{\sigma}_s^2$	$\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ *		95% CI for $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$	
			L	U	L	U
Al	70,595	30,458	0	1.73 E+06	8,254	1.20 E+05
Ca	0	41,181	0	2.29 E+05	14,840	3.40 E+05
Fe	1.38 E+05	22,384	25,347	2.83 E+06	9,327	1.08 E+05
Na	3.86 E+08	2.31 E+08	0	9.00 E+09	9.63 E+07	1.12e+09
Ni	54,992	6,588	12,290	1.11 E+06	2,745	3.19 E+04
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	3.50 E+06	9.30 E+05	3.11 E+05	7.43 E+07	3.87 E+05	4.50 E+06
P	3.52 E+07	4.94 E+06	7.18 E+06	7.17 E+08	2.06 E+06	2.39 E+07

*Approximate 95% confidence interval (CI).

Table 7-11. Potassium Hydroxide/Nickel Fusion Dissolution Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates.

Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% CI for σ_s^2 *		95% CI for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
Al	4.70 E+08	5.67 E+05	1.57 E+08	9.17 E+09	1.54 E+05	2.24 E+07
Ca	4.09 E+07	1.56 E+05	1.37 E+07	7.99 E+08	42,269	6.16 E+06
Fe	1.65 E+07	9.81 E+06	7.56 E+06	4.34 E+08	2.66 E+06	3.88 E+08
Na	5.24 E+08	3.96 E+06	1.76 E+08	1.03 E+10	1.07 E+06	1.57 E+08
Ni	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pb	3.98 E+06	1.47 E+05	1.36 E+06	7.92 E+07	3.99 E+04	5.82 E+06
U	1.78 E+09	1.64 E+07	5.99 E+08	3.49 E+10	4.44 E+06	6.48 E+08
P	8.04 E+07	1.37 E+05	2.69 E+07	1.57 E+09	37,210	5.43 E+06

*Approximate 95% confidence interval (CI).

Table 7-12. Radiochemistry Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates.

Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% CI for σ_s^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
¹³⁷ Cs	4,949	463	1,752	1.02 E+05	125	18,281
⁹⁰ Sr	3.56 E+06	1,360	9.91 E+05	5.78 E+07	369	53,767
U	0	2.76 E+07			7.47 E+06	1.09 E+09
^{239/240} Pu	8.29 E-03	5.4 E-05	2.78 E-03	1.62 E-01	1.5 E-05	2.13 E-03
²³⁸ Pu	1.56 E-02	3.2 E-05	5.23 E-03	3.05 E-01	0.9 E-05	1.27 E-03

*Approximate 95% confidence interval (CI).

Table 7-13. Ion Chromatography Anion Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates.

Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% CI for σ_s^2 *		95% CI for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
Chloride	52,500	25,000	22,784	1.31 E+06	6,775	9.88 E+05
Nitrite	1.04 E+08	1.33 E+08	6.25 E+07	3.56 E+09	3.59 E+07	5.24 E+09
Nitrate	2.21 E+08	2.41 E+08	1.24 E+08	7.09 E+09	6.52 E+07	9.51 E+09
Phosphate	2.97 E+08	1.10 E+08	1.22 E+08	7.07 E+09	2.99 E+07	4.36 E+09
Sulfate	9.17 E+06	6.25 E+06	4.37 E+06	2.51 E+08	1.69 E+06	2.47 E+08

*Approximate 95% confidence interval (CI).

This page intentionally left blank.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 ANALYTICAL RESULTS

Analyses of the waste show a very small number of analytes comprising a large portion of the waste. Water is the single largest analyte, making up over 50 percent of the total mass. Seven elements (aluminum, calcium, iron, sodium, nickel, phosphorus, and uranium) constitute approximately 22.3 percent of the solids mass. They also represent over 95 percent of the total cations. Two anions (NO_2^- and NO_3^-) constitute approximately 10 percent of the mass. The fraction of the total anions that nitrate and nitrite represent cannot be adequately determined because the analytical method measured only soluble anions. The total cyanide content was measured and found to be less than 1 percent (dry basis) in each core and for the tank as a whole.

The only significant gamma emitter found in the waste was ^{137}Cs . Although ^{60}Co was also precipitated during the scavenging process, it has decayed below any level of concern and does not contribute to the heat load of the tank. No meaningful regional concentrations (hot spots) of radioisotopes or fuel were detected along the vertical axis in either core. The ^{137}Cs concentration was relatively constant between Core 34 and Core 36 and the regions with high nickel concentrations correlated with the ^{137}Cs peaks in the gamma scans. These observations are consistent with the historical information regarding the ferrocyanide-scavenging process, the gamma activity pattern obtained from the scans, and the ICP element distribution through the subsegments. The other major source of radiological activity was ^{90}Sr , which had a very skewed distribution between Core 34 and Core 36, probably arising from the later waste transfers into tank 241-C-112 after the ferrocyanide scavenging runs were completed. This is not a "hot spot" type phenomena, but an artifact of sampling near the waste inlet and outlet. There is no evidence of a self-concentration mechanism (Dickinson et al. 1993). Heat-load calculations are further evidence supporting the contention that the relatively high ^{90}Sr concentrations are believed to be a local phenomenon. The bulk waste temperature in the tank, obtained from two thermocouple trees, is 29 °C (85 °F). Comparisons of heat-load calculations, using the temperature profiles from the thermocouple trees and the higher ^{90}Sr concentrations, do not agree with the tank waste temperature measurements and other observations of the tank waste. The radiological activity of tank 241-C-112 waste material was relatively low (ranging from 0.15 to 2 R/hr, measured through the drill string). No significant radiological activity was found in the drainable liquid in the tank or in the water or acid digestion of the samples. This suggests that ^{90}Sr and ^{137}Cs are quite insoluble.

Indications from Core 34 data show that material has physical and chemical properties corresponding to those expected for ferrocyanide waste. Water content, nickel concentration, and density values are consistent with the simulant values. Indications from Core 36 data show that material appears to have ferrocyanide waste overlying a bismuth phosphate first cycle decontamination and/or UR waste heel. However, no firm evidence of BiPO_4 waste was ever found from the assays. The concentration of nickel, calcium, ^{137}Cs , and uranium as a function of depth appears to confirm this observation. In addition, this behavior is consistent with historical

information. However, in both cases DSC results from the suspected ferrocyanide waste in tank 241-C-112 indicate that the material is considerably less energetic than the corresponding waste simulant. Core 35 is indeterminate. It may be a combination of ferrocyanide waste and unscavenged UR waste. Results of aging studies now underway on flowsheet simulants may demonstrate that radiolytic, hydrolytic, and thermal processes in the tanks, over the last 35 years, have combined to dissolve, dilute, and destroy the reactive ferrocyanide compounds. The data from tank 241-C-112 strongly indicate that the waste lacks the fuel concentration to sustain any propagating exothermic behavior, and a heat source intense enough to trigger a reaction is absent.

8.2 ENERGETICS ANALYSIS

Thermodynamic and kinetics (propagation) studies of simulants are bounding the reactivity of the ferrocyanide/oxidizer reactions. Results indicate that U Plant ferrocyanide wastes cannot create a propagating hazard; T Plant waste is expected to behave similarly. Ferrocyanide simulants made by the In Farm flowsheet are more reactive. The waste in tank 241-C-112 and the other C Farm tanks, representing 20 to 25 percent of the ferrocyanide inventory added to the tanks, was made by a similar process and was a potential cause for concern. However, if the In Farm simulants contained at least 15 weight percent water, that moisture content precluded an uncontrolled, propagating reaction (Fauske 1992).

Three core samples were obtained from tank 241-C-112, a tank considered to contain one of the highest concentrations of ferrocyanide. All three cores were broken down into smaller subsegments and examined for reactivity using DSC; none of the samples exhibited any propagating behavior. The samples had a moisture content ranging from 34 to 64 wt% water and a ΔH ranging from -0.02 kJ/g of dry material to -0.04 kJ/g dry material (4.4 to 8.6 cal). The onset temperatures for the exotherms ranged between 275 °C and 290 °C--close to that predicted by the simulants. The simulant may have represented the waste as it was initially precipitated in the tank; several of the physical and chemical properties of the simulants are quite close to those of the tank waste. However, further chemical analysis indicates that the waste material has a total cyanide content much lower than expected from the simulant formulations and, correspondingly, tank 241-C-112 waste material is not as energetic as the analogous waste simulants. Tank 241-C-112 sample material is nearly 30 times less chemically reactive than the comparable In Farm simulant material (tank 241-C-112 waste: -0.04 kJ/g; In Farm simulant: -1.20 kJ/g). The causes of this behavior are hypothesized to be long-term exposure to radiation fields and high pH cladding waste. Both of these conditions are believed to degrade the ferrocyanide complexes. Further testing of simulant materials, as well as results from other ferrocyanide tanks, will aid in confirming this hypothesis.

Calculations of the bulk waste inventory and inventories for several analytes of interest to the various safety issues (ferrocyanide, NO_2^- , NO_3^- , ^{137}Cs , ^{90}Sr , plutonium, and water) were made. The calculated bulk inventory of ferrocyanide (between 8,700 and 11,500 g-mol) was far in excess of the 1,000 g-mol Ferrocyanide Watch List criteria, but the energetics results indicate that particular criteria do not account for the dispersion of the ferrocyanide in the waste (i.e., the concentration may be too low to support a self-sustaining reaction). None of the other calculated bulk inventory values exceeded any level of concern (refer to Table 8-1).

Experimental and analytical evidence from tank 241-C-112 suggests the risk from ferrocyanide compounds in Hanford Site high-level waste tanks is acceptable and that a propagating exothermic ferrocyanide reaction is incredible.

Table 8-1. Comparison of Tank 241-C-112 Analyte Values to Safety Issue Criteria.

Analyte	Safety Issue Criteria ¹	Calculated/Measured Value
$\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$	1,000 g-mol	8,700 to 11,500 g-mol
ΔH (dry basis)	-75 cal/g	-9 cal/g
$^{239/240}\text{Pu}$	50 kg	1.1 to 1.4 kg
Temperature	300 °F (149 °C)	29 °C (85 °F)
Heat Load	11.72 kw	2.26 to 2.44 kw
Organic Content (TOC, Dry basis)	3.0 wt% TOC (10% sodium acetate equivalent)	0.75 wt% TOC

¹(Lindsey 1986; RHO 1988; Boyles 1992; Reep 1992)

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made based on the data and analyses presented in this report and the goals of the characterization effort.

- Gamma scanning assay of segments should be discontinued for SSTs until an adequate core sample from tank 241-BY-104 is obtained.
- The Watch List criteria for the Ferrocyanide waste tank USQ should be expanded so that it includes concentration or energetics based measurements.
- Tank 241-C-112 should be removed from the Ferrocyanide Watch List.

- A statistical comparison between the results from tank 241-C-109 (when available) and tank 241-C-112 should be performed to determine the degree of similarity between the tanks.
- An analysis for the formate anion should be done on the water soluble material to aid in confirming that the ferrocyanide has degraded.
- The DSC analysis should be performed under an inert atmosphere to better represent the waste conditions in the tank.

9.0 REFERENCES

- Abrams, R. B., 1956, *History: Metal Recovery Waste Scavenging Program*, HW-43066, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- Anderson, J. D., 1990, *A History of the 200 Area Tank Farms*, WHC-MR-0132, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Babad, H., B. C. Simpson, R. J. Cash, M. A. Lilga, 1993, *The Role of Aging in Resolving the Ferrocyanide Safety Issue*, WHC-EP-0599, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Bechtold, D. B., 1992, "Analysis of In-Plant Ferrocyanide Solids," Internal Memo 12110-PC92-014, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Bird, R. B, W. E. Stewart, E. N. Lightfoot, 1960, *Transport Phenomena*, John Wiley and Sons. New York, New York.
- Borsheim, G. L. and B. C. Simpson, 1991, *An Assessment of the Inventories of the Ferrocyanide Watchlist Tanks*, WHC-SD-WM-ER-133 Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Boyles, V. C., 1992, *Operating Specifications for Single-Shell Waste Storage Tanks*, OSD-T-151-00013 Rev D-1, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Burger, L. L., 1984, *Complexant Stability Investigation, Task 1, Ferrocyanide Solids*, PNL-5441, Pacific Northwest Laboratories, Richland, Washington.
- Burger, L. L., 1989, *Complexant Stability Investigation, Task 1-Ferrocyanide solids*, PNL-5441, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- Burger, L. L., and R. D. Scheele, 1990, *The Reactivity of Cs₂NiFe(CN)₆ Towards Nitrate and Nitrite Salts*, PNL-7550, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- Cash, R. J., 1993, *Ferrocyanide Safety Program - Removal of Six Tanks from Ferrocyanide Tank List*, (letter 9259120 to J. H. Anttonen, January 14, 1993), Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Colby, S. A., and M. D. Crippen, 1991, *Graphical Presentation of Ferrocyanide Tank Compositions*, WHC-SA-1304-FP, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Dickinson, D. R., J. M. McLaren, G. L. Borsheim, M. D. Crippen, *Ferrocyanide Safety Program: Credibility of Drying Out Ferrocyanide Tank Waste Sludge by Hot Spots*, WHC-EP-0648, Rev. 0, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- DOE, 1987, *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Hanford Defense High-Level Transuranic Wastes, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington*, DOE/EIS-0113, Vol. 1 through 5, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

- Ecology, EPA, and DOE, 1992, *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*, 2 vols., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Energy, Olympia, Washington.
- Fauske, H. K., 1992, *Adiabatic Calorimetry and Reaction Propagation Rate Tests with Synthetic Ferrocyanide Materials Including U Plant-1, U Plant-2, In Farm 1, In Farm 2 and Vendor-Procured Sodium Nickel Ferrocyanide*, Fauske & Associates, Inc., Burr Ridge, Illinois.
- General Electric, 1958, *Record of Scavenged TBP Waste*, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.
- Hanlon, B. M., 1992, *Tank Farm Surveillance and Waste Status Summary Report for September 1992*, WHC-EP-0182-39, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- HASM, 1993, *Single-Shell Tank Characterization Project and Safety Analysis Project Core 34, 35 and 36, Validation Report Tank 241-C-112*, WHC-SD-WM-DP-026, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Hill, J. G., W. I. Winters, B. C. Simpson, J. W. Buck, P. J. Chamberlain, and V. L. Hunter 1991, *Waste Characterization Plan for the Hanford Site Single-Shell Tanks--Appendix I: Test Plan for Sampling and Analysis of Ten Single-Shell Tanks*, WHC-EP-0210 Rev. 3, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Hill, J. G., 1991, *Modified Test Plan for the Ferrocyanide Single-Shell Tanks, 241-C-112, C-109 and T-107*, Correspondence No. 915211, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Jensen, L. and B. J. Whitcher, 1992, "Statistical Analysis of Tank 241-U-110 Data, IV: Concentration Estimates," Internal Memo 12100--PLT92-068, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Jeppson, D. W. and J. J. Wong, 1993, *Ferrocyanide Waste Simulant Characterization*, WHC-EP-0631, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.
- Jungfleisch, F. M., 1984, *TRAC: A Preliminary Estimation of the Waste Inventories in Hanford Tanks Through 1980*, SD-WM-TI-057, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.
- Lilga, M. A., M. R. Lumetta, W. F. Riemath, R. A. Romine, and G. F. Schiefelbein, 1992, "Ferrocyanide Safety Project, Subtask 3.4, Aging Studies FY 1992, Annual Report," PNL-8387 UC-721, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- Lindsey, D. W., 1986, *Operating Specifications for Single-Shell Waste Storage Tanks*, OSD-T-151-00013, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, Section 3137, "Safety Measures for Waste Tanks at Hanford Nuclear Reservation," November 5, 1990.

Peach, J. D., 1990, "Consequences of Explosion of Hanford's Single-Shell Tanks Are Understated," (Letter B-241479 to C. M. Synar, Chairman of Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives), GAO/RCED-91-34, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

Peterson, L. R., H. Babad, S. A. Bryan, A. J. Schmidt, 1993, *Autogeneous Hydrothermal Oxidation in Simulated Hanford Double-Shell Tank Wastes*, PNL-SA-22181, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

RCRA, *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, as amended, 42 USC 6901 et seq.

Reep, I. E., 1992, *Status Report on Resolution of Waste Tank Safety Issues at the Hanford Site*, WHC-EP-0600, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

RHO, 1988, *Criticality Prevention Specifications for Waste Storage Tanks and Associated Equipment*, CPS-T-149-00010, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.

Scheele, R. D., L. L. Burger, J. M. Tingey, S. A. Bryan, G. L. Borsheim, B. C. Simpson, R. J. Cash, and H. H. Cady, 1991, "Ferrocyanide-Containing Waste Tanks: Ferrocyanide Chemistry and Reactivity," in the Proceedings of Environmental Restoration 91, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

Schmidt, W. C., and M. J. Stedwell, 1954, *Production Test 221-T-18 Scavenging of First Cycle Waste*, HW-33252, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.

Schneider, K. J., 1951, *Flow Sheets and Flow Diagrams of Precipitation Separations Processes*, HW-23043, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.

Sloat, R. J., 1954, *TBP Plant Nickel Ferrocyanide Scavenging Flowsheet*, HW-30399, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.

Sloat, R. J., 1955, *In Farm Scavenging Operating Procedure and Control Data*, HW-38955 Rev. 1, General Electric Company, Richland, Washington.

Snedecor, G. W., and W. G. Cochran, 1980, *Statistical Methods*, Seventh Edition, Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa.

Tingey, J. M., J. D. Matheson, S. G. McKinley, T. E. Jones, and K. H. Pool, 1993, *Characterization of Hanford Tank Wastes Containing Ferrocyanides*, PNL-SA-21497, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

Wagner, R. N., 1992, *Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant Feed Characterization*, WHC-SD-HWV-SM-001, Rev. 4, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Wagner, 1992, *Vitrification Plant Feed Characterization Requirement*, Rev. 4, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Weast, R., 1984, *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 64th Ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

WHC-CM-5-3, *Sample Management and Administration*, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Winters, W. I., L. Jensen, L. M. Sasaki, R. L. Weiss, J. F. Keller, A. J. Schmidt, and M. G. Woodruff 1990a, *Waste Characterization Plan for the Hanford Site Single-Shell Tanks*, WHC-EP-0210 Rev. 1, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Winters, W. I., L. Jensen, L. M. Sasaki, R. L. Weiss, J. F. Keller, A. J. Schmidt, and M. G. Woodruff 1990b, *Waste Characterization Plan for the Hanford Site Single-Shell Tanks*, WHC-EP-0210 Rev. 2, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

APPENDIX A

CALCULATIONS

This page intentionally left blank.

2025
2024
2023
2022
2021
2020
2019
2018
2017
2016
2015
2014
2013
2012
2011
2010
2009
2008
2007
2006
2005
2004
2003
2002
2001
2000
1999
1998
1997
1996
1995
1994
1993
1992
1991
1990
1989
1988
1987
1986
1985
1984
1983
1982
1981
1980
1979
1978
1977
1976
1975
1974
1973
1972
1971
1970
1969
1968
1967
1966
1965
1964
1963
1962
1961
1960
1959
1958
1957
1956
1955
1954
1953
1952
1951
1950
1949
1948
1947
1946
1945
1944
1943
1942
1941
1940
1939
1938
1937
1936
1935
1934
1933
1932
1931
1930
1929
1928
1927
1926
1925
1924
1923
1922
1921
1920
1919
1918
1917
1916
1915
1914
1913
1912
1911
1910
1909
1908
1907
1906
1905
1904
1903
1902
1901
1900
1899
1898
1897
1896
1895
1894
1893
1892
1891
1890
1889
1888
1887
1886
1885
1884
1883
1882
1881
1880
1879
1878
1877
1876
1875
1874
1873
1872
1871
1870
1869
1868
1867
1866
1865
1864
1863
1862
1861
1860
1859
1858
1857
1856
1855
1854
1853
1852
1851
1850
1849
1848
1847
1846
1845
1844
1843
1842
1841
1840
1839
1838
1837
1836
1835
1834
1833
1832
1831
1830
1829
1828
1827
1826
1825
1824
1823
1822
1821
1820
1819
1818
1817
1816
1815
1814
1813
1812
1811
1810
1809
1808
1807
1806
1805
1804
1803
1802
1801
1800
1799
1798
1797
1796
1795
1794
1793
1792
1791
1790
1789
1788
1787
1786
1785
1784
1783
1782
1781
1780
1779
1778
1777
1776
1775
1774
1773
1772
1771
1770
1769
1768
1767
1766
1765
1764
1763
1762
1761
1760
1759
1758
1757
1756
1755
1754
1753
1752
1751
1750
1749
1748
1747
1746
1745
1744
1743
1742
1741
1740
1739
1738
1737
1736
1735
1734
1733
1732
1731
1730
1729
1728
1727
1726
1725
1724
1723
1722
1721
1720
1719
1718
1717
1716
1715
1714
1713
1712
1711
1710
1709
1708
1707
1706
1705
1704
1703
1702
1701
1700
1699
1698
1697
1696
1695
1694
1693
1692
1691
1690
1689
1688
1687
1686
1685
1684
1683
1682
1681
1680
1679
1678
1677
1676
1675
1674
1673
1672
1671
1670
1669
1668
1667
1666
1665
1664
1663
1662
1661
1660
1659
1658
1657
1656
1655
1654
1653
1652
1651
1650
1649
1648
1647
1646
1645
1644
1643
1642
1641
1640
1639
1638
1637
1636
1635
1634
1633
1632
1631
1630
1629
1628
1627
1626
1625
1624
1623
1622
1621
1620
1619
1618
1617
1616
1615
1614
1613
1612
1611
1610
1609
1608
1607
1606
1605
1604
1603
1602
1601
1600
1599
1598
1597
1596
1595
1594
1593
1592
1591
1590
1589
1588
1587
1586
1585
1584
1583
1582
1581
1580
1579
1578
1577
1576
1575
1574
1573
1572
1571
1570
1569
1568
1567
1566
1565
1564
1563
1562
1561
1560
1559
1558
1557
1556
1555
1554
1553
1552
1551
1550
1549
1548
1547
1546
1545
1544
1543
1542
1541
1540
1539
1538
1537
1536
1535
1534
1533
1532
1531
1530
1529
1528
1527
1526
1525
1524
1523
1522
1521
1520
1519
1518
1517
1516
1515
1514
1513
1512
1511
1510
1509
1508
1507
1506
1505
1504
1503
1502
1501
1500
1499
1498
1497
1496
1495
1494
1493
1492
1491
1490
1489
1488
1487
1486
1485
1484
1483
1482
1481
1480
1479
1478
1477
1476
1475
1474
1473
1472
1471
1470
1469
1468
1467
1466
1465
1464
1463
1462
1461
1460
1459
1458
1457
1456
1455
1454
1453
1452
1451
1450
1449
1448
1447
1446
1445
1444
1443
1442
1441
1440
1439
1438
1437
1436
1435
1434
1433
1432
1431
1430
1429
1428
1427
1426
1425
1424
1423
1422
1421
1420
1419
1418
1417
1416
1415
1414
1413
1412
1411
1410
1409
1408
1407
1406
1405
1404
1403
1402
1401
1400
1399
1398
1397
1396
1395
1394
1393
1392
1391
1390
1389
1388
1387
1386
1385
1384
1383
1382
1381
1380
1379
1378
1377
1376
1375
1374
1373
1372
1371
1370
1369
1368
1367
1366
1365
1364
1363
1362
1361
1360
1359
1358
1357
1356
1355
1354
1353
1352
1351
1350
1349
1348
1347
1346
1345
1344
1343
1342
1341
1340
1339
1338
1337
1336
1335
1334
1333
1332
1331
1330
1329
1328
1327
1326
1325
1324
1323
1322
1321
1320
1319
1318
1317
1316
1315
1314
1313
1312
1311
1310
1309
1308
1307
1306
1305
1304
1303
1302
1301
1300
1299
1298
1297
1296
1295
1294
1293
1292
1291
1290
1289
1288
1287
1286
1285
1284
1283
1282
1281
1280
1279
1278
1277
1276
1275
1274
1273
1272
1271
1270
1269
1268
1267
1266
1265
1264
1263
1262
1261
1260
1259
1258
1257
1256
1255
1254
1253
1252
1251
1250
1249
1248
1247
1246
1245
1244
1243
1242
1241
1240
1239
1238
1237
1236
1235
1234
1233
1232
1231
1230
1229
1228
1227
1226
1225
1224
1223
1222
1221
1220
1219
1218
1217
1216
1215
1214
1213
1212
1211
1210
1209
1208
1207
1206
1205
1204
1203
1202
1201
1200
1199
1198
1197
1196
1195
1194
1193
1192
1191
1190
1189
1188
1187
1186
1185
1184
1183
1182
1181
1180
1179
1178
1177
1176
1175
1174
1173
1172
1171
1170
1169
1168
1167
1166
1165
1164
1163
1162
1161
1160
1159
1158
1157
1156
1155
1154
1153
1152
1151
1150
1149
1148
1147
1146
1145
1144
1143
1142
1141
1140
1139
1138
1137
1136
1135
1134
1133
1132
1131
1130
1129
1128
1127
1126
1125
1124
1123
1122
1121
1120
1119
1118
1117
1116
1115
1114
1113
1112
1111
1110
1109
1108
1107
1106
1105
1104
1103
1102
1101
1100
1099
1098
1097
1096
1095
1094
1093
1092
1091
1090
1089
1088
1087
1086
1085
1084
1083
1082
1081
1080
1079
1078
1077
1076
1075
1074
1073
1072
1071
1070
1069
1068
1067
1066
1065
1064
1063
1062
1061
1060
1059
1058
1057
1056
1055
1054
1053
1052
1051
1050
1049
1048
1047
1046
1045
1044
1043
1042
1041
1040
1039
1038
1037
1036
1035
1034
1033
1032
1031
1030
1029
1028
1027
1026
1025
1024
1023
1022
1021
1020
1019
1018
1017
1016
1015
1014
1013
1012
1011
1010
1009
1008
1007
1006
1005
1004
1003
1002
1001
1000
999
998
997
996
995
994
993
992
991
990
989
988
987
986
985
984
983
982
981
980
979
978
977
976
975
974
973
972
971
970
969
968
967
966
965
964
963
962
961
960
959
958
957
956
955
954
953
952
951
950
949
948
947
946
945
944
943
942
941
940
939
938
937
936
935
934
933
932
931
930
929
928
927
926
925
924
923
922
921
920
919
918
917
916
915
914
913
912
911
910
909
908
907
906
905
904
903
902
901
900
899
898
897
896
895
894
893
892
891
890
889
888
887
886
885
884
883
882
881
880
879
878
877
876
875
874
873
872
871
870
869
868
867
866
865
864
863
862
861
860
859
858
857
856
855
854
853
852
851
850
849
848
847
846
845
844
843
842
841
840
839
838
837
836
835
834
833
832
831
830
829
828
827
826
825
824
823
822
821
820
819
818
817
816
815
814
813
812
811
810
809
808
807
806
805
804
803
802
801
800
799
798
797
796
795
794
793
792
791
790
789
788
787
786
785
784
783
782
781
780
779
778
777
776
775
774
773
772
771
770
769
768
767
766
765
764
763
762
761
760
759
758
757
756
755
754
753
752
751
750
749
748
747
746
745
744
743
742
741
740
739
738
737
736
735
734
733
732
731
730
729
728
727
726
725
724
723
722
721
720
719
718
717
716
715
714
713
712
711
710
709
708
707
706
705
704
703
702
701
700
699
698
697
696
695
694
693
692
691
690
689
688
687
686
685
684
683
682
681
680
679
678
677
676
675
674
673
672
671
670
669
668
667
666
665
664
663
662
661
660
659
658
657
656
655
654
653
652
651
650
649
648
647
646
645
644
643
642
641
640
639
638
637
636
635
634
633
632
631
630
629
628
627
626
625
624
623
622
621
620
619
618
617
616
615
614
613
612
611
610
609
608
607
606
605
604
603
602
601
600
599
598
597
596
595
594
593
592
591
590
589
588
587
586
585
584
583
582
581
580
579
578
577
576
575
574
573
572
571
570
569
568
567
566
565
564
563
562
561
560
559
558
557
556
555
554
553
552
551
550
549
548
547
546
545
544
543
542
541
540
539
538
537
536
535
534
533
532
531
530
529
528
527
526
525
524
523
522
521
520
519
518
517
516
515
514
513
512
511
510
509
508
507
506
505
504
503
502
501
500
499
498
497
496
495
494
493
492
491
490
489
488
487
486
485
484
483
482
481
480
479
478
477
476
475
474
473
472
471
470
469
468
467
466
465
464
463
462
461
460
459
458
457
456
455
454
453
452
451
450
449
448
447
446
445
444
443
442
441
440
439
438
437
436
435
434
433
432
431
430
429
428
427
426
425
424
423
422
421
420
419
418
417
416
415
414
413
412
411
410
409
408
407
406
405
404
403
402
401
400
399
398
397
396
395
394
393
392
391
390
389
388
387
386
385
384
383
382
381
380
379
378
377
376
375
374
373
372
371
370
369
368
367
366
365
364
363
362
361
360
359
358
357
356
355
354
353
352
351
350
349
348
347
346
345
344
343
342
341
340
339
338
337
336
335
334
333
332
331
330
329
328
327
326
325
324
323
322
321
320
319
318
317
316
315
314
313
312
311
310
309
308
307
306
305
304
303
302
301
300
299
298
297
296
295
294
293
292
291
290
289
288
287
286
285
284
283
282
281
280
279
278
277
276
275
274
273
272
271
270
269
268
267
266
265
264
263
262
261
260
259
258
257
256
255
254
253
252
251
250
249
248
247
246
245
244
243
242
241
240
239
238
237
236
235
234
233
232
231
230
229
228
227
226
225
224
223
222
221
220
219
218
217
216
215
214
213
212
211
210
209
208
207
206
205
204
203
202
201
200
199
198
197
196
195
194
193
192
191
190
189
188
187
186
185
184
183
182
181
180
179
178
177
176
175
174
173
172
171
170
169
168
167
166
165
164
163
162
161
160
159
158
157
156
155
154
153
152
151
150
149
148
147
146
145
144
143
142
141
140
139
138
137
136
135
134
133
132
131
130
129
128
127
126
125
124
123
122
121
120
119
118
117
116
115
114
113
112
111
110
109
108
107
106
105
104
103
102
101
100
99
98
97
96
95
94
93
92
91
90
89
88
87
86
85
84
83
82
81
80
79
78
77
76
75
74
73
72
71
70
69
68
67
66
65
64
63
62
61
60
59
58
57
56
55
54
53
52
51
50
49
48
47
46
45
44
43
42
41
40
39
38
37
36
35
34
33
32
31
30
29
28
27
26
25
24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0

APPENDIX A

CALCULATIONS

Theoretical Energetic Behavior of C-112 Waste:

Assume 1.0 and 1.5 vol% precipitate formation; use waste volumes generated from Borsheim-Simpson spreadsheet model.

Ferrocyanide waste volume: @ 1.0 vol% = 31,000 gallons
@ 1.5 vol% = 42,600 gallons

Input mole of ferrocyanide: 78,445 g-mol $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$

Calculated moles
ferrocyanide remaining: @ 1.0 vol% = 65,900 g-mol $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
@ 1.5 vol% = 60,400 g-mol $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$

Analytical estimate 72,100 g-mol $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
derived from Ni content
(discounting Ni from ^{60}Co scavenging).

Bulk Mass of Ferrocyanide waste (Density = 1.50 g/mL):

(31,000 gal)*(3785 mL/gal)*(1.50 g/mL) = 1.76E+08 g waste
(42,600 gal)*(3785 mL/gal)*(1.50 g/mL) = 2.42E+08 g waste

Mass of Ferrocyanide in Ferrocyanide waste:

@ 1.0 vol% = (65,900 g-mol)*(316.7 g/g-mol) = 2.09E+07 g $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
@ 1.5 vol% = (60,400 g-mol)*(316.7 g/g-mol) = 1.91E+07 g $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$

Weight Percent Ferrocyanide in waste (range):

@ 1.0 vol% : $\frac{2.09\text{E}+07 \text{ g } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6}{1.76\text{E}+08 \text{ g waste}} * (100) = 11.88 \text{ wt\%}$

@ 1.5 vol% : $\frac{1.91\text{E}+07 \text{ g } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6}{2.42\text{E}+08 \text{ g waste}} * (100) = 7.89 \text{ wt\%}$

Assume 51% average water content, 49% solids
(In Farm-1 simulants; Jeppson and Wong 1993)

Weight Percent Ferrocyanide (Dry basis)

@ 1.0 vol% : $\frac{2.09\text{E}+07 \text{ g } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6}{1.76\text{E}+08 \text{ g waste (0.49)}} * (100) = 24.24 \text{ wt\%}$

@ 1.5 vol% : $\frac{1.91\text{E}+07 \text{ g } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6}{2.42\text{E}+08 \text{ g waste (0.49)}} * (100) = 16.10 \text{ wt\%}$

Table A-1. Energetic Properties of Waste Simulants (Fauske 1992).

Simulant	Ferrocyanide Content (Dry basis)	$\Delta H_{\text{simulant}}$ (kJ/g dry simulant)	$\Delta H_{\text{ferrocyanide}}$ (kJ/g $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$)
U Plant-1	4.3 wt%	-0.17	-3.95
U Plant-2	8.6 wt%	-0.34	-3.95
In Farm-1	25.5 wt%	-1.20	-4.71

A direct, linear relationship can be assumed between the ferrocyanide (or cyanide) content of the waste and the energy content of the material.

$$\Delta H_{\text{sample}} = (\text{Wt\% Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6) * (-3.95 \text{ KJ/g Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6)$$

Therefore, the theoretical energetic behavior of the waste as it was initially stored in tank 241-C-112 is between:

$$(16.1\%) * (-3.95) = -0.64 \text{ KJ/g waste; or } 152 \text{ cal/g waste}$$

$$(24.24\%) * (-3.95) = -0.96 \text{ KJ/g waste; or } 229 \text{ cal/g waste}$$

The basis for the exothermic potential of the reaction is -3.95 KJ/g $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$. This value is used for several reasons. The measurement of the two U Plant simulants was performed on much larger samples, thus is not as sensitive to rounding and experimental error. In addition, the measured gaseous products from the U Plant reaction were 0.075 moles produced out of a theoretical 0.11 moles; this represents a release fraction of 68.2%, suggesting incomplete or less efficient combustion. There are several alternative reaction paths, however, the most reactive thermodynamic pathway has a ΔH of -9.6 KJ/g $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$. Therefore a reaction efficiency for this waste matrix is $(-3.95/-9.6) * 100 = 41.1\%$. It can be assumed that the release fraction and reaction efficiency in the waste matrix would not be any greater than that exhibited by the simulants. However, greater heats of reaction can be expected from mixtures with higher fuel contents, as long as there is sufficient oxidizer. This behavior is expected because factors contributing to combustion efficiency are more favorable: (1) a higher fuel/oxidant interface and (2) fewer solid diluents. This may be why the In Farm-1 simulant exhibits a higher heat of reaction than the U Plant simulants.

Determination of ^{137}Cs values from Revised Borsheim/Simpson Model:

The approximate amount of ^{137}Cs processed through 241-C-112 during the scavenging campaign was 748,000 Ci. The half-life of ^{137}Cs is 30.17 years. The decay period for the waste is assumed to be 35 years (1958-1993). The decay factor for this timespan is thus:

$$e^{-(\ln 2/30.17) * 35} = 0.4475$$

Therefore, the ^{137}Cs remaining from the scavenging campaign is $(748,000 \text{ Ci}) * (0.4475) = 334,700 \text{ Ci}$

The amount of ^{137}Cs captured in the tank is assumed to be directly proportional to the amount of ferrocyanide waste solids retained.

Gallons of ferrocyanide solids produced: @ 1.0 vol% = 46,200 gallons
@ 1.5 vol% = 69,300 gallons

Calculated volume ferrocyanide waste retained: @ 1.0 vol% = 31,000 gallons
@ 1.5 vol% = 42,600 gallons

Calculated transfer losses: @ 1.0 vol% = 15,200 gallons
12,600 g-mol $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
to BC-18 and/or BY-108

@ 1.5 vol% = 26,700 gallons
18,000 g-mol $\text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$
to BC-10, BC-18, and/or BY-108

^{137}Cs retained in 241-C-112:

@ 1.0 vol% = $\frac{31,000 \text{ gallons}}{46,200 \text{ gallons}} * (334,700 \text{ Ci}) = 224,600 \text{ Ci}$

@ 1.5 vol% = $\frac{42,600 \text{ gallons}}{69,300 \text{ gallons}} * (334,700 \text{ Ci}) = 205,700 \text{ Ci}$

Comparison of Actual Waste Values with Theoretical Estimates

Total cyanide values can provide estimates of ferrocyanide content; and this derived ferrocyanide content can be used to determine the energy content of the sample (assuming all cyanide detected is present as ferrocyanide).

$$\frac{(316.7 \text{ g/g-mol } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6)}{(156 \text{ g CN/g-mol } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6)} * (\text{Wt\% cyanide}) = \text{Wt\% } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$$

and using the derived ferrocyanide value in the previously described energetic relationship:

$$\Delta H_{\text{sample}} = (\text{Wt\% } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6) * (-3.95 \text{ KJ/g } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6) \quad (1)$$

Conversely, the energy content of the waste is a reasonable indicator of the ferrocyanide content in the waste. By rearranging Equation (1)

$$\frac{\Delta H_{\text{sample}}}{-3.95 \text{ KJ/g } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6} = \text{Wt\% } \text{Na}_2\text{NiFe}(\text{CN})_6$$

However, because of the semi-quantitative nature of the DSC assay, values obtained in this manner are likely no better than qualitative results ($\pm 100\%$) for low fuel concentrations/small exotherms. For samples with high fuel contents (and consequently, exhibiting strong exotherms), the values are considered much more accurate.

Calculation of Bulk Inventories for Analytes of Importance

From the distribution of the solids and liquids in the samples, the measurements from tank farm surveillance, and the analyte profiles from the quarter-segments, two representations of the overall tank profile can be visualized (Figures A-1 and A-2). These observations from the tank suggest that there are distinct regions in the tank, each possessing a specific volume and characteristic compositions. For the first interpretation, these regions are:

- Dished Bottom: First Cycle BiPO_4 waste or Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 1: Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 2: Unscavenged UR waste and Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Tank Layer 3: Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Supernatant

The volumes for each region were derived as follows:

- Dished Bottom: 15,000 gallons (57,700 L)

The volume of the dish is accepted as 12,500 gallons; in addition it is believed that an additional inch of the same waste (2,750 gallons) rests on top of the material in the dish. This gives a volume of approximately 15,000 gallons.

- Tank Layer 1: 9,800 gallons (37,100 L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 1.5 subsegments high on one side and 0 subsegments high on the other. $(2,750 \text{ gallons/inch}) \times (4.75 \text{ in./subsegment}) \times [0.5 \times (1.5 + 0 \text{ subsegments})] = 9,800 \text{ gallons.}$

- Tank Layer 2: 9,800 gallons (37,100 L)

Same as Tank Layer 1

- Tank Layer 3: 41,800 gallons (158,000 L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 2.5 subsegments high on the Core 36 side and 3.9 subsegments high on the Core 34 side. $(2,750 \text{ gallons/inch}) \times [(4.75 \text{ in./subsegment}) \times (2.5 \text{ subsegments}) + (0.5) \times (4.75) \times (1.4 \text{ subsegments})] = 41,800 \text{ gallons.}$


Total Solids Volume = 76,400 gallons (289,000 L)

- Supernatant: 36,300 gallons (137,000L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 6.4 inches high (45.3-38.9) on the Core 36 side and 13.6 inches high (45.3-31.7) on the Core 34 side. $(2,750 \text{ gallons/inch}) \times (6.4 \text{ in.}) + (0.5) \times (2,750 \text{ gallons}) \times (13.6 \text{ in.}) = 36,300 \text{ gallons.}$

Total Waste Volume: 112,700 gallons

Figure A-1. Waste Profile of Tank 241-C-112.
(First Interpretation)



- Dished Bottom: First Cycle BiPO_4 waste or Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 1: Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 2: Unscavenged UR waste and Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Tank Layer 3: Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Supernatant

Check calculated volume with tank surveillance records: 104,000 gallons

$$\text{Percent Difference} = \frac{112,700 - 104,000}{104,000} \times 100 = +8.4\%$$

Using these volumes and a bulk density of 1.50 g/mL for the solids and 1.27 g/mL for the supernatant, masses for the various regions can be calculated. Also, representative concentrations for the various analytes from each of the regions can be developed.

Table A-2: Basis for Bulk Inventory Calculations.

Tank Region	Volume (gallons)	Mass (Mg)	Concentration Values Used for Inventory Estimate
Dished Bottom	15,000	85.2	Core 36-2D
Tank Layer 1	9,800	55.6	Avg. Core 36-2C and 36-2D
Tank Layer 2	9,800	55.6	Core 36-2B
Tank Layer 3	41,800	237.3	Avg. Core 36-2A, 36-1D, 36-1C and Core 34-2D, 34-2C, 34-2B
Supernatant	36,300	174.5	Avg. Core 34 and Core 35 Drainable liquid
Total	112,700	608.2	

Tables A-3, A-5, and A-7 show the concentration values used to calculate the inventories. Tables A-4, A-6, and A-8 show the calculated bulk inventories for selected analytes.

Table A-3. Bulk Inventory Basis for Energetics Analytes.

	Table A-3: Bulk Inventory Basis for Energetics Analytes						
	VOLUME	MASS	TOC	TOTAL CN	NO2	NO3	H2O
	(gal)	(g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)
Dish	15000	85162500	2300	5600	35000	51000	560000
Layer 1	9800	55639500	2600	4800	33500	48500	600000
Layer 2	9800	55639500	2700	7500	30000	42500	410000
Layer 3	41800	237319500	4500	7300	49200	64700	545000
Supernatant	36300	174492285	1700	3800	55000	72000	700000
Totals	112700	608253285					

Table A-4. Calculated Inventories for Energetic Analytes.

Table A-3: Bulk Inventory Basis for Energetics Analytes							
	VOLUME	MASS	TOC	TOTAL CN	NO2	NO3	H2O
	(gal)	(g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)
Dish	15000	85162500	2300	5600	35000	51000	560000
Layer 1	9800	55639500	2600	4800	33500	48500	600000
Layer 2	9800	55639500	2700	7500	30000	42500	410000
Layer 3	41800	237319500	4500	7300	49200	64700	545000
Supernatant	36300	174492285	1700	3800	55000	72000	700000
Totals	112700	608253285					
Table A-4: Calculated Inventories for Energetic Analytes							
			TOC	TOTAL CN	NO2	NO3	H2O
			(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)
Dish			195874	209840	2980688	4343288	47691000
Layer 1			144663	106828	1863923	2698516	33383700
Layer 2			150227	246205	1669185	2364679	22812195
Layer 3			1067938	788257	11676119	15354572	129339128
Supernatant			296637	198921	9597076	12563445	122144600
Mass Wet Solids (g)			1558701	1351130	18189915	24761054	233226023
Wt%			0.36	0.31	4.19	5.71	53.77
Total Mass (g)			1855338	1550051	27786991	37324498	355370622
Wt%			0.31	0.25	4.57	6.14	58.42

Table A-5. Bulk Inventory Basis for Cesium-137 and Strontium-90.

	Table A-5: Bulk Inventory Basis for Cesium-137 and Strontium-90						
	VOL	MASS	Cs-137	Sr-90			
			(uCi/g)	(uCi/g)			
	15000	85162500	40	200			
	9800	55639500	70	170			
	9800	55639500	530	70			
	41800	237319500	760	645			
	36300	174492285	0.026	0.29			

Table A-6. Calculated Inventories for Cesium-137 and Strontium-90.

Table A-6: Calculated Inventories for Cesium-137 and Strontium-90						
			Cs-137 (Ci)	Sr-90 (Ci)		
Dish			3407	17033		
Layer 1			3895	9459		
Layer 2			29489	3895		
Layer 3			180363	153071		
Supernatant			5	51		
Totals (Ci)			217158	183508		


Table A-7. Bulk Inventory Basis for ICP Cations (wet solids).

Table A-7: Bulk Inventory Basis for ICP Cations (wet solids)								
VOL	MASS	Al	Ca	Fe	Na	Ni	P	U
(gal)	(g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)
15000	85162500	3000	2100	31200	105100	900	29900	58000
9800	55639500	2600	2600	23200	105500	950	31800	84000
9800	55639500	3100	8900	8900	90600	4800	25200	170000
41800	237319500	15900	22150	16600	85400	21600	18400	12700

Table A-8. Calculated Inventory for ICP Cations (wet solids).

Table A-8: Calculated Inventory for ICP Cations (wet solids)								
		Al	Ca	Fe	Na	Ni	P	U
		(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)
Dish		255488	178841	2657070	8950579	76646	2546359	4939425
Layer 1		144663	144663	1290836	5869967	52858	1769336	4673718
Layer 2		172482	495192	495192	5040939	267070	1402115	9458715
Layer 3		3773380	5256627	3939504	20267085	5126101	4366679	3013958
Total Mass (g)	433761000	4346013	6075322	8382602	40128570	5522675	10084489	22085816
Wt%		1.00	1.40	1.93	9.25	1.27	2.32	5.09

Figure A-2. Waste Profile of Tank 241-C-112.
(Second Interpretation)



- Dished Bottom: First Cycle BiPO_4 waste or Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 1: Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 2: Unscavenged UR waste and Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Tank Layer 3: Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Tank Layer 4: Hot Semiworks Waste; Coating Waste; and Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Supernatant

Similarly, a profile can be developed for the second interpretation:

- Dished Bottom: First Cycle BiPO_4 waste or Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 1: Unscavenged Uranium Recovery (UR) waste
- Tank Layer 2: Unscavenged UR waste and Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Tank Layer 3: Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Tank Layer 4: Hot Semiworks Waste; Coating Waste; and Ferrocyanide Scavenging Waste
- Supernatant

The volumes for each region were derived as follows:

- Dished Bottom: 15,000 gallons (57,700 L)

The volume of the dish is accepted as 12,500 gallons; in addition it is believed that an additional inch of the same waste (2,750 gallons) rests on top of the material in the dish. This gives a volume of approximately 15,000 gallons.

- Tank Layer 1: 19,600 gallons (74,200 L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 1.5 subsegments high (2,750 gallons/inch)*(4.75 in./subsegment)*(1.5 subsegments)] = 19,600 gallons.

- Tank Layer 2: 9,800 gallons (37,100 L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 1.5 subsegments high on one side and 0 subsegments high on the other. (2,750 gallons/inch)*(4.75 in./subsegment)*[0.5*(1.5+0 subsegments)] = 9,800 gallons.

- Tank Layer 3: 41,800 gallons (158,000 L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 2.5 subsegments high on the Core 36 side and 3.9 subsegments high on the Core 34 side. (2,750 gallons/inch)*[(4.75 in./subsegment)*(2.5 subsegments) + (0.5)*(4.75)*(1.4 subsegments)] = 41,800 gallons.

- Tank Layer 4: 13,000 gallons (49,200 L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 1 subsegments high (2,750 gallons/inch)*[(4.75 in./subsegment)] = 13,000 gallons.

Total Solids Volume = 99,200 gallons (375,500 L)

- Supernatant: 9,900 gallons (137,000L)

Calculate a volume using a slab 3.6 inches high on Core 35. The liquid level indicated from Core 34 may be biased because of the presence of a deep liquid pool. $(2,750 \text{ gallons/inch}) \times (3.6 \text{ in.}) = 9,900 \text{ gallons (37,500 L)}$.

Total Waste Volume: 109,100 gallons

Check calculated volume with tank surveillance records: 104,000 gallons

$$\text{Percent Difference} = \frac{109,100 - 104,000}{104,000} \times 100 = +4.9\%$$

Using these volumes and a bulk density of 1.50 g/mL for the solids and 1.27 g/mL for the supernatant, masses for the various regions can be calculated. Also, representative concentrations for the various analytes from each of the regions can be developed.

Table A-9: Basis for Bulk Inventory Calculations.

Tank Region	Volume (gallons)	Mass (Mg)	Concentration Values Used for Inventory Estimate
Dished Bottom	15,000	85.2	Core 36-2D
Tank Layer 1	19,600	111.3	Avg. Core 36-2C and 36-2D
Tank Layer 2	9,800	55.6	Core 36-2B
Tank Layer 3	41,800	237.3	Avg. Core 36-2A, 36-1D, and Core 34-2D, 34-2C
Tank Layer 4	13,000	73.8	Avg. Core 36-1C and Core 34-2B
Supernatant	9,900	47.6	Avg. Core 34 and Core 35 Drainable liquid
Total	109,100	610.8	

Tables A-10, A-12, and A-14 show the concentration values used to calculate the inventories. Tables A-11, A-13 and A-15 show the calculated bulk inventories for selected analytes.

Table A-10. Bulk Inventory Basis for Energetics Analyses.
(Second Interpretation)

	VOLUME (gal)	MASS (g)	TOC (ug/g)	TOTAL CN (ug/g)	NO2 (ug/g)	NO3 (ug/g)	H2O (ug/g)
Dish	15000	85162500	2300	5600	35000	51000	560000
Layer 1	19600	111279000	2600	4800	33500	48500	600000
Layer 2	9800	55639500	2700	7500	30000	42500	410000
Layer 3	41800	237319500	4000	8100	48400	64100	485000
Layer 4	13000	73807500	5600	4300	50800	65800	560000
Supernatant	9900	47588805	1700	3800	55000	72000	700000
Totals	109100	610796805					

9313045.0220

Table A-11. Calculated Inventories for Energetic Analytes.
(Second Interpretation)

	TOC (g)	TOTAL CN (g)	NO2 (g)	NO3 (g)	H2O (g)
Dish	195874	209840	2980688	4343288	47691000
Layer 1	289325	213656	3727847	5397032	66767400
Layer 2	150227	246205	1669185	2364679	22812195
Layer 3	949278	989978	11486264	15212180	115099958
Layer 4	413322	139644	3749421	4856534	41332200
Supernatant	80901	54251	2617384	3426394	33312164
Mass Wet Solids (g)	1998026	1799323	23613404	32173711	293702753
Wt%	0.35	0.32	4.19	5.71	52.15
Total Mass (g)	2078927	1853574	26230788	35600105	327014916
Wt%	0.34	0.30	4.29	5.83	53.54

Table A-12. Bulk Inventory Basis for Cesium-137 and Strontium-90.
(Second Interpretation)

VOL	MASS	Cs-137 (uCi/g)	Sr-90 (uCi/g)
15000	85162500	40	200
19600	111279000	70	170
9800	55639500	530	70
41800	237319500	850	18
13000	73807500	590	1600
9900	47588805	0.026	0.29

Table A-13. Calculated Inventories for Cesium-137 and Strontium-90.
(Second Interpretation)

	Cs-137 (Ci)	Sr-90 (Ci)	
Dish	3407	17033	
Layer 1	7790	18917	
Layer 2	29489	3895	
Layer 3	201722	4272	
Layer 4	43546	118092	
Supernatant	1	14	
Totals (Ci)	285954	162222	
	1349.703	1086.889	2436.592888

Table A-14. Bulk Inventory Basis for ICP Cations (wet solids).
(Second Interpretation)

VOL (gal)	MASS (g)	Al (ug/g)	Ca (ug/g)	Fe (ug/g)	Na (ug/g)	Ni (ug/g)	P (ug/g)	U (ug/g)
15000	85162500	3000	2100	31200	105100	900	29900	58000
19600	1.1E+08	2600	2600	23200	105500	950	31800	84000
9800	55639500	3100	8900	8900	90600	4800	25200	170000
41800	2.4E+08	12800	25900	12200	85500	21400	19900	17200
13000	73807500	23600	25300	25400	85200	22000	21000	3700

9313046.0224

Table A-15. Calculated Inventory for ICP Cations (wet solids).
(Second Interpretation)

		Al (g)	Ca (g)	Fe (g)	Na (g)	Ni (g)	P (g)	U (g)
Dish		255488	178841	2657070	8950579	76646	2546359	4939425
Layer 1		289325	289325	2581673	11739935	105715	3538672	9347436
Layer 2		172482	495192	495192	5040939	267070	1402115	9458715
Layer 3		3037690	6146575	2895298	20290817	5078637	4722658	4081895
Layer 4		1741857	1867330	1874711	6288399	1623765	1549958	273088
Total Mass (g	5.6E+08	5496842	8977263	10503943	52310668	7151833	13759762	28100559
Wt%		0.98	1.59	1.87	9.29	1.27	2.44	4.99

Compare ICP water leach phosphorous value with IC phosphate value.

Formula weights: P: 31 ; PO_4^{3-} : 95

Multiplier to
convert P to PO_4^{3-} : $\frac{95 \text{ g } \text{PO}_4^{3-}/\text{g-mol}}{31 \text{ g P/g-mol}} = 3.1$

Table A-16: Comparison of Water Leach ICP Phosphorous Value with IC Phosphate Value.

Sample	Water Leach P ICP value ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Converted PO_4^{3-} value derived from ICP ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	IC PO_4^{3-} Value ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Percent Difference
Core 34	6380	19600	19100	2.6
Core 35	5630	17300	17800	-2.8
Core 36	16500	50600	49500	2.2

Since phosphates were used extensively in waste processing, assume all insoluble P is present as PO_4^{3-} ; subtract fusion ICP P value and add corrected amount to PO_4^{3-} .

To correct mass balance for unanalyzed hydroxide content, multiply analyte concentration by multiplier.

Other multipliers:

Aluminum; assume aluminum is present predominantly as $\text{Al}(\text{OH})_3$.

Formula weights: Al: 27 ; $\text{Al}(\text{OH})_3$: 78

Multiplier to
convert Al to $\text{Al}(\text{OH})_3$: $\frac{78 \text{ g } \text{Al}(\text{OH})_3/\text{g-mol}}{27 \text{ g Al/g-mol}} = 2.9$

Iron; assume iron is present predominantly as $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2$.

Formula weights: Fe: 56 ; $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2$: 90

Multiplier to
convert Fe to $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2$: $\frac{90 \text{ g } \text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2/\text{g-mol}}{56 \text{ g Fe/g-mol}} = 1.6$

Nickel; assume nickel is present predominantly as $\text{Ni}(\text{OH})_2$.

Formula weights: Ni: 58 ; $\text{Ni}(\text{OH})_2$: 92

Multiplier to
convert Ni to $\text{Ni}(\text{OH})_2$: $\frac{92 \text{ g Ni}(\text{OH})_2/\text{g-mol}}{58 \text{ g Ni/g-mol}} = 1.6$

Uranium; assume uranium is present predominantly as $\text{UO}_2(\text{OH})_2$.

Formula weights: U: 238 ; $\text{UO}_2(\text{OH})_2$: 304

Multiplier to
convert U to $\text{UO}_2(\text{OH})_2$: $\frac{304 \text{ g UO}_2(\text{OH})_2/\text{g-mol}}{238 \text{ g U/g-mol}} = 1.3$

Total Carbon; assume carbon is present in three forms, and that the TOC and TIC assays did not consume or measure any cyanide:

Organic carbon (as acetate): $\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{O}_2^-$
Inorganic carbon (as carbonate): CO_3^{2-}
Ferrocyanide carbon (as cyanide): CN^-

Formula weights: C: 12 ; $\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{O}_2^-$: 59; CO_3^{2-} : 60

Multiplier to
convert TOC to acetate: $\frac{59 \text{ g C}_2\text{H}_3\text{O}_2^-/\text{g-mol}}{24 \text{ g C/g-mol}} = 2.45$

Multiplier to convert
TIC to carbonate: $\frac{60 \text{ g CO}_3/\text{g-mol}}{12 \text{ g C/g-mol}} = 5$

Table A-17: Energetic Calculations.

Sample	Measured Heat of Reaction (J/wet g)	Wt Fraction Solid	Measured Heat of Reaction (J/dry g)	Measured Heat of Reaction (cal/dry g)
34-1D	-17	0.8	-21.25	-5.08
34-2B	-12	0.43	-27.91	-6.68
34-2C	-13	0.51	-25.49	-6.10
34-2D	-17	0.61	-27.87	-6.67
34-Comp.	-11	0.59	-18.64	-4.46
35-2D	-12	0.52	-23.08	-5.52
36-1C	-11	0.52	-21.15	-5.06
36-1D	-16	0.45	-35.56	-8.51
36-2A	-10	0.48	-20.83	-4.98
36-2B	-9	0.46	-19.57	-4.68
36-2C	No Exotherm		No Exotherm	No Exotherm
36-2D	No Exotherm		No Exotherm	No Exotherm
36-Comp.	-19	0.53	-35.85	-8.58

Table A-18. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.0 vol%. (2 sheets)

TANK-C112 ASSUME 1% SLUDGE FORMATION									
DATE	TANK CHG. (GAL)	SUPERNATE (GAL)	SLUDGE (GAL)	TRANSFER AMOUNT	SUPERNAT AMT. IN TANK	GALLONS SUPERNAT TRANS.	GAL. SLUDGE TRANS.	GAL. SUPER. REMAIN.	GAL. SLUDGE REMAIN.
INIT.	92371	62871	29500	0	62871	0	0	62871	29500
1-1955-4	464077	459436	4641	453060	522307	453060	0	69247	34141
3-1956-1	486110	481249	4861	527423	550496	527423	0	23073	39002
6-1956-2	479225	474433	4792	407617	497506	407617	0	89889	43794
7-1956-3	396600	392634	3966	476471	482523	476471	0	6052	47760
9-1957-2	472340	467617	4723	488865	473668	473668	15197	0	37287
12-1957-2	506767	501699	5068	487488	501700	487488	0	14212	42354
15-1957-3	475094	470343	4751	457192	484555	457192	0	27363	47105
20-1957-3	466831	462163	4668	470963	489526	470963	0	18563	51773
24-1957-4	459946	455347	4599	414502	473909	414502	0	59407	56373
28-1957-4	413125	408994	4131	444798	468401	444798	0	23603	60504
	4712486	4636785	75701	4628379	5007462	4613182	15197	23603	60504
		TOTAL	LIQUID	SOLID					
TANK VOL (GAL)=		84107	23603	60504					
Tank Ht.(FT)=		3.2	0.7	2.5					

Table A-18. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.0 vol%.

TOTAL WASTE REMAIN.	MOLES Fe(CN) ₆ REMAIN.	MOLES Fe(CN) ₆ PRECIP'D	MOLES Fe(CN) ₆ TRANS.	DISPOSAL LOCATION
92371	0	0	0	C-112
103388	8783	8783	0	BC-4
62075	17982	9200	0	C108
133683	27052	9069	0	BC-3
53812	34557	7506	0	BC-10
37287	30902	8939	12595	BC-18,BY108
56566	40492	9591	0	BY102
74468	40492	0	0	BC-6
70336	49327	8835	0	BC-6
115780	58031	8704	0	BC-21
84107	65850	7818	0	BC-22
84107	65850	78445	12595	

Table A-19. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.0 vol%, Post-Scavenging.

TANK-C112 POST-1957 TRANSFERS										
DATE	TANK CH (GAL)	TRANSFER FROM	SUPERNAT (GAL)	SLUDGE (GAL)	TRANSFER AMOUNT	SUPERNAT AMT. IN TANK	GALLONS SUPER. TRANS.	GAL. SLUDGE TRANS.	GAL. SUPER. REMAIN.	GAL. SLUDGE REMAIN.
1957-4	84107		23603	60504		23603		0	23603	60504
1960-2	126000	SS, CW	119000	7000		142603		0	142603	67504
1960-4	137000	CW	134000	3000		276603		0	276603	70504
1961-1	138000	LEVEL ADJ.	127000	11000		403603		0	403603	81504
1961-3	31000	HS	29000	2000		432603		0	432603	83504
1962-2	22000	HS	20600	1400		453203		0	453203	84904
1970-1	21000	301C	21000		340000	474203	340000	0	134203	84904
1970-2	327000	110C	327000			461203		0	461203	84904
1975-1	19000	301C	19000		66000	480203	66000	0	414203	84904
1975-3	109000	110C	109000		400000	523203	400000	0	123203	84904
1975-4					85000	123203	85000	0	38203	84904
1976-2	REMOVED FROM SERVICE									
1976-3	SALT WELL PUMPING				17000	38203	17000	0	21203	84904
1977-3	END OF SALT WELL PUMPING									
			TOTAL	LIQUIDS	SOLIDS					
TANK VOL (GAL)=			106107.0	21203.0	84904.0					
Tank Ht.(FT)=			3.8	0.6	3.2					

Table A-19. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.0 vol%, Post-Scavenging.

<u>GAL. WASTE ACCUM.</u>	<u>TRANSFER TO</u>
84107.0	
210107.0	
347107.0	
485107.0	???
516107.0	
538107.0	
219107.0	104C
546107.0	
499107.0	103C
208107.0	103C
123107.0	103C
106107.0	

Table A-20. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.5 vol%. (2 sheets)

TANK-C112 ASSUME 1.5% SLUDGE FORMATION									
DATE	TANK CHG. (GAL)	SUPERNATE (GAL)	SLUDGE (GAL)	TRANSFER AMOUNT	SUPERNAT AMT. IN TANK	GALLONS SUPERNAT TRANS.	GAL. SLUDGE TRANS.	GAL. SUPER. REMAIN.	GAL. SLUDGE REMAIN.
INIT.	92371	62871	29500	0	62871	0	0	62871	29500
1-1955-4	464077	457116	6961	453060	519987	453060	0	66927	36461
3-1956-1	486110	478818	7292	527423	545745	527423	0	18322	43753
6-1956-2	479225	472037	7188	407617	490359	407617	0	82742	50941
7-1956-3	396600	390651	5949	476471	473393	473393	3078	0	53812
9-1957-2	472340	465255	7085	488865	465255	465255	23610	0	37287
12-1957-2	506767	499165	7602	487488	499165	487488	0	11677	44889
15-1957-3	475094	467968	7126	457192	479645	457192	0	22453	52015
20-1957-3	466831	459829	7002	470963	482281	470963	0	11318	59018
24-1957-4	459946	453047	6899	414502	464365	414502	0	49863	65917
28-1957-4	413125	406928	6197	444798	456791	444798	0	11993	72114
	4712486	4613684	98802	4628379	4939857	4601691	26688	11993	72114
		TOTAL	LIQUID	SOLID					
TANK VOL (GAL)=		84107	11993	72114					
Tank Ht.(FT)=		3.2	0.4	2.8					

Table A-20. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.5 vol%.

TOTAL WASTE REMAIN.	MOLES Fe(CN)6 REMAIN.	MOLES Fe(CN)6 PRECIP'D	MOLES Fe(CN)6 TRANS.	DISPOSAL LOCATION
92371	0	0	0	C-112
103388	8783	8783	0	BC-4
62075	17982	9200	0	C108
133683	27052	9069	0	BC-3
53812	32688	7506	1870	BC-10
37287	25488	8939	16139	BC-18,BY108
56566	35078	9591	0	BY102
74468	35078	0	0	BC-6
70336	43913	8835	0	BC-6
115780	52618	8704	0	BC-21
84107	60436	7818	0	BC-22
84107	60436	78445	18008	

Table A-21. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.5 vol%, Post-Scavenging.

TANK-C112 POST-1957 TRANSFERS										
DATE	TANK CH (GAL)	TRANSFER FROM	SUPERNAT (GAL)	SLUDGE (GAL)	TRANSFER AMOUNT	SUPERNAT AMT. IN TANK	GALLONS SUPER. TRANS.	GAL. SLUDGE TRANS.	GAL. SUPER. REMAIN.	GAL. SLUDGE REMAIN.
1957-4	84107		11993	72114		11993		0	11993	72114
1960-2	126000	SS, CW	119000	7000		130993		0	130993	79114
1960-4	137000	CW	134000	3000		264993		0	264993	82114
1961-1	138000	LEVEL ADJ.	127000	11000		391993		0	391993	93114
1961-3	31000	HS	29000	2000		420993		0	420993	95114
1962-2	22000	HS	20600	1400		441593		0	441593	96514
1970-1	21000	301C	21000		340000	462593	340000	0	122593	96514
1970-2	327000	110C	327000			449593		0	449593	96514
1975-1	19000	301C	19000		66000	468593	66000	0	402593	96514
1975-3	109000	110C	109000		400000	511593	400000	0	111593	96514
1975-4					85000	111593	85000	0	26593	96514
1976-2	REMOVED FROM SERVICE									
1976-3	SALT WELL PUMPING				17000	26593	17000	0	9593	96514
1977-3	END OF SALT WELL PUMPING									
			TOTAL	LIQUIDS	SOLIDS					
TANK VOL (GAL)=			106107.0	9593.0	96514.0					
Tank Ht.(FT)=			3.8	0.3	3.5					

Table A-21. Borsheim-Simpson Model Run at 1.5 vol%, Post-Scavenging.

GAL. WASTE ACCUM.	TRANSFER TO
84107.0	
210107.0	
347107.0	
485107.0	???
516107.0	
538107.0	
219107.0	104C
546107.0	
499107.0	103C
208107.0	103C
123107.0	103C
106107.0	

Typical process stream calculations:

Coating Waste: Calculate wt% ($\mu\text{g/g}$) composition of Al, Si, and U. Use composition given on pg. 8 of HW-23043 and reduce water content.

7,900 lbs total 6,154 lbs water 638 lbs NaAlO_2 (in solute)
1,746 lbs solute 1 lb uranium

Assume $\text{NaAlO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Al(OH)}_3$ (s); NaSiO_3 precipitates as well, other compounds remain in solution.

Dry solids mass = $638 \text{ lbs } \text{NaAlO}_2 \cdot \frac{78 \text{ lb Al(OH)}_3/\text{mol}}{82 \text{ lb NaAlO}_2/\text{mol}} + 27 \text{ lb NaSiO}_3 = 633.9 \text{ lb}$

Analyte mass: $27 \text{ lb Al} / 78 \text{ lb Al(OH)}_3 \cdot 606.9 \text{ lbs Al(OH)}_3 = 210 \text{ lbs Al}$
 $28 \text{ lb Si} / 99 \text{ lb NaSiO}_3 \cdot 27 \text{ lb NaSiO}_3 = 7.7 \text{ lb Si}$

Table A-22. Typical Analyte Concentrations in Precipitated Coating Waste

Analyte	Mass (lbs)	Dry Wt%	Concentration ($\mu\text{g/dry g}$)	Concentration @ 40% water ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Concentration @ 50% water ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
Al	210	33.1	331,000	198,600	165,500
Si	7.66	1.21	12,100	7,260	6,050
U	1	0.16	1,600	960	800

Neutralized IC Waste: Calculate wt% ($\mu\text{g/g}$) composition of Bi, Si, F, and U; use composition given on pg. 32 of HW-23043.

18,500 lbs total 15,413 lbs water 44 lbs Bi 802.5 lbs Na
3,087 lbs solute 3.8 lbs U 73.8 lbs SiF_6^{2-} 1,579 lbs NO_3^-

Assume NO_3^- is present as NaNO_3 , thus $\frac{1,579.5 \text{ lbs} \cdot 453.6 \text{ g/lb}}{2,040 \text{ gal} \cdot 3.785 \text{ L/gal} \cdot 62 \text{ g/mol}} = 1.5 \text{ M } \text{NO}_3^-$

1.5 M is not near saturation; water and nitrate do not precipitate.

The amount of sodium that precipitates is that not associated with the nitrate: Total moles of sodium = $802.5 \text{ lbs} / 23 \text{ lb/mol}$ or 34.9 lb-mol

$\frac{1,579.5 \text{ lbs } \text{NO}_3^-}{62 \text{ lbs/mol}} = 25.5 \text{ lb-mol nitrate (and associated sodium)}$

Mass of sodium nitrate in solution: $25.5 \text{ lb-mol} \cdot 85 \text{ lb/lb-mol} = 2,165 \text{ lbs}$.

Therefore, $(34.9-25.5 \text{ lb-mol}) \times 23 \text{ lb Na/lb-mol} = 216.7 \text{ lbs Na precipitate}$ and $585.8 \text{ lb Na remain in solution}$. If everything but the NaNO_3 and water precipitate, then the mass of dry solids = $18,500 \text{ lbs} - (15,413 + 2,165) = 922 \text{ lbs}$.

Table A-23. Typical Analyte Concentrations in Precipitated 1C Waste

Analyte	Mass	Dry Wt%	Dry Concentration ($\mu\text{g/g}$)	Concentration @ 50 water ($\mu\text{g/wet g}$)	Concentration @ 40% water ($\mu\text{g/wet g}$)
Bi	44	4.77	47,700	23,850	28,620
Si	14.6	1.58	15,800	7,900	9,480
F	59.2	6.42	64,200	32,100	38,520
U	3.8	0.41	4,100	2,050	2,460

UR waste: Calculate wt% ($\mu\text{g/g}$) composition of U at a density of 1.3. Use flowsheet composition given on pg. 5 of HW-30399. Uranium concentrations will range from 0.007 to 0.14 M (flowsheet concentrations to 20x flowsheet) or approximately 1.67 to 33.32 g U/L.

Wt% uranium would then range from $1.67 \times 100 / 1,300 = 0.128\%$ or $1,280 \mu\text{g/g}$, to $33.32 \times 100 / 1,300 = 2.5\%$ or $25,000 \mu\text{g/g}$. These would increase by 25 to 30%, if the original water content of the sludge (~75 wt%) decreased to 50 wt%.

This page intentionally left blank.

0320-5166-0

APPENDIX B

STATISTICAL INTERPRETATIONS

This page intentionally left blank.

**Westinghouse
Hanford Company****Internal
Memo**

From: Process Laboratories and Technology
Phone: 3-4034/3-2779 T6-07
Date: March 15, 1993
Subject: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF TANK 241-C-112 DATA

12100-PLT93-020

To: B. C. Simpson R2-12

cc: D. A. Dodd T6-50
J. G. Hill R2-12
L. M. Sasaki R2-12
J. P. Sloughter T6-07
R. L. Weiss H4-23
T. L. Welsh T6-07
W. I. Winters T6-50
KMR:LJ File/LB

- References:
- (1) Internal Memo, L. Jensen and B. J. Whitcher to A. F. Noonan, "Statistical Analysis of Tank 241-U-110 Data, IV: Concentration Estimates," dated July 23, 1993.
 - (2) WHC-EP-0210, W. I. Winters, et al., Waste Characterization Plan for the Hanford Site Single-Shell Tanks, Revision 1, dated August 1990.
 - (3) Book, G. W. Snedecor and W. G. Cochran, Statistical Methods, Seventh Edition, Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, dated 1980.

Summary

This memo contains the results of a statistical analysis of data from three core samples taken from Single-Shell Tank (SST) 241-C-112. The results are divided into four parts.

- The first part contains mean concentration estimates of several analytes found in the SST. In addition, 95% confidence intervals (CI) on the mean concentration are also given.
- The second part contains the results of a statistical test conducted to determine the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory's (325 Building) ability to homogenize solid core segments. The statistical results indicate that the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory can satisfactorily homogenize core segments.
- Part three contains the results of a statistical test conducted to determine the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory's ability to construct core composite samples from quarter segment samples.

B. C. Simpson
Page 2
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

Eighty-nine percent (25 out of 28) of the comparisons showed that the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory's ability to construct core composite samples was satisfactory. The only analytes showing test results to the contrary were Na, Cl, and SO₄ from core 34.

- The fourth part contains a comparison of the spatial variability (variability between cores) and the analytical error associated with the core samples taken from SST 241-C-112. CIs are given for both sources of variability. In general, the spatial variability in the core composite samples is of the same order of magnitude, or larger, than the analytical error.

Introduction

Three cores samples (cores 34, 35 and 36) were taken from SST 241-C-112. The results from a chemical analysis of the cores are used to obtain mean concentration estimates for analytes in the waste. In addition, the data is used to evaluate the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory's ability to homogenize quarter segments and to construct core composite samples.

The core sample recovery for SST 241-C-112 was incomplete. Quarter segments 1D, 2B, 2C, and 2D represent core 34. Quarter segment 2D represents core 35. Quarter segments 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D comprise core 36. There were also drainable liquids from cores 34 and 35.

Composite samples, for each core, were made from homogenized quarter segment waste. The core composite sample from core 35 is quarter segment 2D. Drainable liquid composite samples were also made for cores 34 and 35. A sample and duplicate were taken from each core composite and quarter segment. For the homogenization test, additional samples and duplicates were taken from two different locations on each quarter segment.

The laboratory results from SST 241-C-112 samples are tabulated in Attachment 1. The analytes of interest from the Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) analyses are Al, Ca, Fe, Na, Ni, Pb, U, and P. The ICP Acid Digestion, and Water Leach analyses were conducted on all composite core samples. The ICP KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution analyses were performed on the quarter segments and core composite samples from all three cores. The Core 34 composite duplicate results were only reported for the ICP Acid Digestion analyses (see Tables 1, 2, and 3).

Radio chemistry results for U, Pu-238, Pu-239/240, Cs-137, and Sr-90 were reported for core composite samples. The quarter segments were only analyzed (Radio Chemistry) for Cs-137 and Sr-90 (see Table 4).

Each quarter segment and core composite sample was analyzed (Ion Chromatography) for Cl, NO₂, NO₃, PO₄, SO₄ (see Table 5). Table 6 contains ICP Acid Digestion analysis results for the homogenization test.

B. C. Simpson
Page 3
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

Attachment 7 shows graphically the ICP KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution, Radio Chemistry, and Ion Chromatography Analyses results for core composite and quarter segment samples. Graphs of the quarter segment homogenization test data are also found in Attachment 7.

Mean Concentration Estimates

A task in applying the Waste Characterization Plan to SST 241-C-112 data was to estimate the constituent concentrations (Reference 2, Section 3.3.3). This task was accomplished by computing mean concentrations and 95% CIs on the mean concentrations. It should be emphasized that mean concentration estimates of the analytes were computed, not estimates of the inventory of the analytes in the tank.

Tables 1 through 5 contain the core composite data used to compute the mean concentration estimates and the CIs. The "NA" symbol indicates that the data was not available.

Statistical Methods

The concentration estimates are given in the form of 95% CIs on the mean concentration of analytes. It is assumed that each sample and duplicate are analyzed independently of one another to yield adequate estimates of analytical error. Due to the hierarchical structure of the data, the analytical error alone is not the appropriate error term to use in the CI calculations. A linear combination of the analytical error and spatial variability is the appropriate variance measure for the CIs. The discussion of the formulas used to calculate these CIs is given in the Appendix of Reference 1.

Statistical Results

Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 contain summary statistics, by analyte, for ICP Acid Digestion, ICP Water Leach, ICP KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution, Radio Chemistry, and Ion Chromatography Anion analyses respectively. The summary statistics are as follows:

- \bar{y} : arithmetic mean of the concentration data
- BMS: "between mean squares" from the one-way analysis of variance (see Reference 1)
- $\hat{\sigma}_y^2$: estimated variance of \bar{y}
- df: degrees of freedom associated with BMS
- L: lower limit to the 95% CI on the mean
- U: upper limit to the 95% CI on the mean

B. C. Simpson
Page 4
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

For some analytes the lower confidence limit (L) was negative. Since concentrations are strictly greater than or equal to zero, any negative L values were set equal to zero.

ICP Acid Digestion drainable liquid composite (DLC) results for Ca, Fe, Ni, U, and P were one or two orders of magnitude smaller than the solid core composite results. For this reason, two sets of summary statistics are given for ICP Acid Digestion and ICP Water Leach analysis methods. One set includes the DLC results and the other set excludes them. In all but two cases, the upper confidence limit for the analysis including the DLCs was smaller than upper confidence limit for the analysis excluding the DLCs.

The concentration confidence limits for uranium should be viewed with caution. This interval is based on only three core composite sample results from cores 34 and 36. The upper confidence limit is far beyond the range of the three sample results due to the small sample size.

Homogenization Test

A second task in applying the Waste Characterization Plan to core samples from Tank 241-C-112 was to evaluate the ability of the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to homogenize quarter segments (Reference 2, Section 3.3.4).

Each quarter segment, from cores 34, 35, and 36 was homogenized and arbitrarily divided into two parts. One sub-sample was obtained from each part. Two aliquots were taken from each sub-sample and prepared for chemical analysis. The homogenization test data described above is tabulated in Table 6 (Attachment 1). ICP Acid Digestion analyses were conducted on the aliquots for the following analytes: Al, Fe, Na, Ni, Pb, U, P.

Statistical Methods and Results

Due to the hierarchical structure (sub-samples within quarter segments, aliquots within sub-samples), a hierarchical statistical model was fit to the data. Reference 3 (page 284) contains a description of the hierarchical statistical model. This model is used to separate different components of variability in the data. The total variability in the data is decomposed into three components: one due to variability between quarter segments, one due to the variability between samples taken from different locations on each homogenized quarter segment (σ_L^2), and one due to the analytical error. The analytical error accounts for the differences between aliquots taken from the same location. These three components of variability, as a percent of the total, are given in Table 12. It should be noted that the largest contributor to the total variability, is the between segment variability, not that due to the homogenization.

To quantify the contribution of σ_L^2 (the component of variability due to location or homogenization), the analysis of variance (ANOVA) corresponding to the hierarchical model is used. From the ANOVA, a test can be constructed to determine if σ_L^2 is significantly different from 0. If σ_L^2 is significantly different from zero then it is concluded that the laboratory does not have the ability to homogenize quarter segments. If σ_L^2 is not

B. C. Simpson
Page 5
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

significantly different from zero, it is concluded that the laboratory has the ability to homogenize core segments. An F-test was used to test significance of σ_L^2 . The p-values (the attained level of significances), from these tests are given in Table 12. If the p-value is smaller than 0.05 then σ_L^2 is significantly different from zero. For each analyte, the F-test indicated that σ_L^2 is not significantly different from zero. This indicates that the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory can adequately homogenize core segments.

Core Composite Construction Test

Another task in applying the Waste Characterization Plan to core samples from Tank 241-C-112 was to evaluate the ability of the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory to make core composites from the individual quarter segment samples (Reference 2, Section 3.3.7.2). Core composites were formed by combining equally weighted samples from each homogenized quarter segment in the core. Each core composite was then homogenized. A sample and duplicate were then taken from each core composite.

A simulated core composite (SCC) was statistically constructed to compare with to the corresponding core composite result. For each core, the SCCs are the average of all quarter segment results for each analyte of interest. This mean or average is denoted by \bar{y}_w . The subscript "w" is used since \bar{y}_w is generally a weighted mean. However, in this case the weights are all equal. An "i" subscript should be included for \bar{y}_w to denote the different SCCs calculated for each core. This subscript is excluded to simplify notation.

Statistical Methods

The chemical analysis methods used to analyze quarter segment samples (ICP KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution, Radio Chemistry, Ion Chromatography) did not report duplicate core 34 composite results. For this reason, the method used to compare the core composite with the SCC for core 36 is different than the method used for core 34.

Core 34 Statistical Methods

A CI on the SCC is calculated to make the comparison between the core composite and the SCC from core 34. If the core composite sample result is contained within the CI, we conclude that the laboratory can satisfactorily construct a core composite (i.e., SCC cannot be statistically distinguished from the core composite). If the core composite result is not contained within the CI, we conclude that the laboratory cannot satisfactorily construct core composites (i.e., there is a significant difference between the core composite sample and SCC).

B. C. Simpson
Page 6
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

The CI on the SCC is (L, U) where the lower (L) and (U) values are

$$L = \bar{y}_w - t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)}, \quad U = \bar{y}_w + t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)}$$

where $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)$ is the estimated variance of \bar{y}_w , and "t" is the appropriate percentile point from Student's t-distribution. The Appendix (Attachment 6) outlines the method used to calculate $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)$.

Core 36 Statistical Methods

For Core 36, the comparison between the core composite and SCC is made by computing a CI on the difference between the SCC and the mean of the composite sample. If zero is in the CI, it is concluded that the laboratory can construct core composites satisfactorily (i.e., the SCC cannot be statistically distinguished from the core composite sample mean). If zero is not in the CI, it is concluded that the laboratory cannot satisfactorily construct core composites (i.e., the two means are significantly different).

The CI for this difference is (L, U) where the lower (L) and (U) values are

$$L = (\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c) - t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)}, \quad U = (\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c) + t\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)}$$

where

- \bar{y}_c : mean of the two core composite sample results,
- t: percentile point from Student's t distribution, and
- $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$: is the estimated variance of the difference.

The Appendix (Attachment 6) outlines the method used to calculate $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$. The estimated variance $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$ was calculated using the data from all three cores because of the limited information available. The degrees of freedom (df) associated with "t" were calculated using Satterhwaite's approximation (Reference 3, page 228).

Statistical Results

Table 13 (Attachment 4) contains summary statistics for core 34, including the 95% CI (L,U) on the SCC. There were only three analytes (Na, Cl, SO_4) which had composite sample results that were outside of the CI limits. In all three cases the composite sample exceeded the upper limit of the CI. In other words, the core composite sample is significantly greater than the SCC for core 34 Na, Cl and SO_4 .

Table 14 (Attachment 4) contains summary statistics for core 36, including the 95% CI interval (L,U) on the difference between the SCC mean and the core composite mean. All of the CIs on this difference contained zero.

B. C. Simpson
Page 7
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

This indicates that there were not significant differences between the two means (i.e., the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory can construct a core composite sample from material similar to core 36).

Attachment 7 contains figures of the segment and core composite data for all three cores which may aid in understanding the results from Tables 13 and 14.

Overall, the simulated core composite could not be statistically distinguished from the core composite in 89% (25 out of 28) of the cases tested. We generally conclude that the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory's ability to construct core composites is satisfactory.

Spatial Variability and Analytical Error Estimation

Using the hierarchical structure of the core composite data, the spatial variability and the analytical error can be separated from each other. The spatial variability is the variability between cores. The analytical error includes among other things, the segment homogenization error, the sample handling error, and the chemical analysis error.

The size of the analytical error relative to the spatial variability has an impact on the mean concentration CIs for each analyte. The variance used in these CI calculations is a linear function of spatial and analytical error estimates. Since the size of the analytical error can potentially be controlled, this comparison is interesting to discuss.

Statistical Methods

Estimates of the spatial variability (σ_s^2)¹ and analytical error (σ_a^2) were obtained for each analyte by solving a system of equations using the expected mean squares from hierarchical model ANOVA results. This method is explained in Reference 3 (page 246).

Reference 3 (page 246) also explains methods used to obtain CIs for σ_s^2 and σ_a^2 . The CI for σ_s^2 is approximate. The CI for σ_a^2 is exact.

Statistical Results

Tables 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Attachment 5) contain 95% CIs for σ_s^2 and σ_a^2 for all 14 analytes and chemical analysis methods. For the ICP Acid Digestion and ICP Water Leach analyses results were tabulated including the DLCs and excluding the DLCs.

Using the variance component estimation methods described above, it is possible to obtain negative variance estimates. Negative variance estimates and negative lower CI limits were set equal to zero.

¹An estimate of a variance component is indicated by a "^" over the variance component symbol σ^2 .


B. C. Simpson
Page 8
March 15, 1993

12100-PLT93-020

For the Acid Digestion analysis (Tables 15), including and excluding the DLCs change the values of $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$. When the DLCs were included, $\hat{\sigma}_a^2$ generally decreased in magnitude and $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ generally increased in magnitude.

For the Radio Chemistry uranium analysis, an estimate and approximate CI for σ_s^2 were not obtained due to the small amount of data.

In general, the upper limits (U) on the approximate 95% CIs for σ_s^2 were larger than the 95% CI upper limits for σ_a^2 (86% of the cases). From this result it can be generally concluded that the spatial variability (σ_s^2) is the same magnitude or larger than the analytical error (σ_a^2) from the core composite samples.



K. M. Remund, Advanced Statistician
Process Laboratories and Technology



L. Jensen, Principal Statistician
Process Laboratories and Technology

llu

Attachments 7

Table 1. Acid Digestion Core Composite Data

Core	ICP Analysis ($\mu\text{g/g}$)			
	Al	Ca	Fe	Na
34*	NA	307	1055	82310
	NA	297	1059	82816
34	24173	22462	26227	97347
	22378	20838	13920	92815
35*	NA	394	741	70213
	NA	433	750	69613
35	37836	12422	27893	76362
	51345	10673	24166	65283
36	5385	16174	19600	102729
	5667	17888	19315	102864

Core	ICP Analysis ($\mu\text{g/g}$)			
	Ni	Pb	U	P
34*	637	NA	1136	3709
	636	NA	1132	3712
34	18242	3128	12412	19319
	17202	2793	11809	18878
35*	437	NA	932	3977
	447	NA	924	3941
35	11707	3904	89549	20996
	10397	3739	68790	16622
36	9620	840	91473	31796
	11511	913	76301	29882

* drainable liquid composite

Table 2. KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution Core Composite and Quarter Segment Data

Core	Quarter Segment	ICP Analysis ($\mu\text{g/g}$)						
		Al	Ca	Fe	Na	Pb	U	P
34	1D	19074 16222	26041 30357	8743 8297	90862 91101	1494 NA	NA NA	11987 13523
	2B	32484 32241	21620 21787	14862 14592	86858 91136	3768 3477	NA NA	11551
	2C	14143 20495	30638 29142	9798 10701	79272 100681	NA NA	NA NA	19738 19752
	2D	26418 27318	23631 23936	18483 20887	78902 78213	2791 2842	20464 19732	19809 19101
	Comp.	29798	28984	22847	114891	3326	14369	21956
35	2D	45791 44289	14676 15310	29941 34764	81974 81142	4261 5001	86289 93172	21854 22526
36	1C	14990 14372	29758 28109	34125 38006	82377 80370	2733 2830	NA NA	19155 19349
	1D	4013 3898	28897 28246	7364 7656	82799 80602	NA NA	NA NA	19480 19155
	2A	2999 2857	22411 20289	11750 10847	91675 91998	NA NA	41400 38267	22300 20053
	2B	3040 3088	8710 9113	8881 8940	90051 91138	NA NA	171775 177587	24748 25720
	2C	2111 2039	3001 3020	15655 14605	105515 105889	NA NA	115926 108452	34517 32602
	2D	2944 3023	2123 2134	30859 31572	104335 105942	771 817	57961 59672	29587 30127
	Comp.	6356 6464	20155 20626	28011 24012	118784 122676	1151 947	107042 102778	36604 36917

Comp.: core composite sample data

Table 3. Water Leach Core Composite Data

Core	ICP Analysis ($\mu\text{g/g}$)			
	Al	Ca	Fe	Na
34	315	240	1630	104939
34*	NA	NA	1210	86016
	NA	NA	1196	85326
35	333	304	703	60689
	327	374	722	60364
35*	NA	44	788	71152
	NA	37	791	71500
36	988	194	1452	130962
	639	577	1336	85753

Core	ICP Analysis ($\mu\text{g/g}$)			
	Ni	Pb	U	P
34	999	NA	715	6380
34*	793	NA	1148	3796
	784	NA	1123	3820
35	403	NA	476	5705
	411	NA	444	5556
35*	491	NA	978	3986
	493	NA	981	4111
36	827	NA	6207	19807
	756	NA	2986	13093

* drainable liquid composite

Table 4. Radio Chemistry Core Composite and Quarter Segment Data

Core	Quarter Segments	(μCi/g)				
		U	Pu-238	Pu-239/240	Cs-137	Sr-90
34	1D	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	169 316	1640 991
	2B	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	613 611	4950 4770
	2C	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	801 788	1130 1150
	2D	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	513 502	2450 2570
	Comp.	17.7	0.0137	0.1550	750	3510
35	2D	NA NA	0.1470 0.1550	0.0130 0.0143	686 716	3220 3200
36	1C	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	579 546	1800 1910
	1D	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	1250 1230	14 16
	2A	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	933 835	15 24
	2B	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	529 535	71 70
	2C	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	105 100	148 139
	2D	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	35 35	195 203
	Comp.	88.9 99.2	0.0033 0.0034	0.0644 0.0541	795 790	543 472

Comp.: core composite sample data

Table 5. Ion Chromatography Data

Core	Quarter Segment	(μg/g)				
		Cl	NO ₂	NO ₃	PO ₄	SO ₄
34	1D	1100 1100	61000 59000	80000 78000	10800 12500	14200 14600
	2B	1000 1000	53000 54000	69000 70000	12000 12200	13100 13000
	2C	900 900	48000 49000	64000 65000	11200 11900	11600 11900
	2D	800 900	44000 47000	58000 61000	16500 18500	10700 11600
	Comp.	1300	62000	80000	19100	15600
	DLC	1000 1000	55000 55000	72000 72000	11700 11600	11700 11600
35	2D	800 700	34000 35000	43000 44000	18100 17600	8600 8600
	DLC	900 900	46000 46000	58000 59000	12900 13000	10900 10900
36	1C	900 900	50000 46000	64000 60000	17700 15500	12600 11500
	1D	900 1000	49000 53000	64000 69000	16600 19000	12500 13500
	2A	900 900	48000 49000	66000 66000	23300 22400	12500 12300
	2B	600 600	31000 29000	43000 42000	20400 20400	8300 7800
	2C	700 600	33000 31000	48000 44000	38000 43000	8900 8300
	2D	700 700	35000 35000	51000 51000	54000 56000	9500 9500
	Comp.	1200 900	64000 41000	87000 56000	60000 39000	16200 11200

Comp.: core composite sample data

DLC: drainable liquid composite

Table 6. Homogenization Test Data
Page 1 of 2

Core	Quarter Segment	Location	ICP Acid Digestion ($\mu\text{g/g}$)			
			Al	Fe	Na	Ni
34	2C	1	11920 12234	12426 7064	85165 83680	18605 16778
		2	11418 10536	9984 6236	80119 83402	17283 16830
	2D	1	34578 22444	15055 14867	74795 82802	14072 15580
		2	27791 23400	30159 15230	79291 84930	15501 16406
35	2D	1	35097 35751	28603 25806	68701 69416	11287 10978
		2	30843 31431	23400 25481	66797 71332	10211 10758
36	1C	1	10520 10423	24343 19251	74657 75027	18371 18404
		2	11613 10401	27043 19227	73045 71706	17505 18540
	2D	1	2782 2826	29671 30210	95604 97629	751 769
		2	3307 3667	29656 32875	93803 99336	777 854

Table 6. Homogenization Test Data
Page 2 of 2

Core	Quarter Segment	Location	ICP Acid Digestion, ($\mu\text{g/g}$)		
			Pb	U	P
34	2C	1	1321 1140	5978 5796	17980 17803
		2	1166 1066	6248 5660	17574 17488
	2D	1	2594 2480	18947 20339	16581 18483
		2	3130 2661	20285 22038	18355 19544
	2D	1	3865 3796	86499 84819	19290 18972
		2	3461 3978	77991 81653	17638 18879
36	1C	1	2196 2168	4519 4498	18505 18561
		2	2356 2135	4276 4449	17332 18109
	2D	1	966 963	56633 57462	28234 28989
		2	1237 1337	55873 61867	28721 31131

Table 7. Acid Digestion Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	σ_y^2	df	L	U
Al	2.45e+04	7.65e+08	1.28e+08	2	0.00	7.31e+04
Ca	1.67e+04	5.12e+07	8.53e+06	2	4.18e+03	2.93e+04
Fe	2.19e+04	2.63e+07	4.39e+06	2	1.28e+04	3.09e+04
Na	8.96e+04	5.57e+08	9.28e+07	2	4.81e+04	1.31e+05
Ni	1.31e+04	3.20e+07	5.33e+06	2	3.18e+03	2.30e+04
Pb	2.55e+03	4.59e+06	7.64e+05	2	0.00	6.31e+03
U	5.84e+04	3.22e+09	5.37e+08	2	0.00	1.58e+05
P	2.29e+04	9.42e+07	1.57e+07	2	5.86e+03	4.00e+04
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	σ_y^2	df	L	U
Al	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ca	1.02e+04	1.87e+08	1.87e+07	4	0.00	2.22e+04
Fe	1.35e+04	2.77e+08	2.77e+07	4	0.00	2.81e+04
Na	8.42e+04	4.25e+08	4.25e+07	4	6.61e+04	1.02e+05
Ni	8.08e+03	1.11e+08	1.11e+07	4	0.00	1.73e+04
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	3.54e+04	3.59e+09	3.59e+08	4	0.00	8.80e+04
P	1.53e+04	2.66e+08	2.66e+07	4	9.78e+02	2.96e+04

Table 8. KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)

Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	σ_y^2	df	L	U
Al	26540	7.53e+08	1.51e+08	2	0	79337
Ca	19950	65570881	13114176	2	4367	35533
Fe	27915	36153926	7230785	2	16344	39486
Na	103893	8.43e+08	1.69e+08	2	48026	159760
Ni	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pb	2937	6508141	1301628	2	0	7846
U	80730	2.87e+09	5.74e+08	2	0	183779
P	27971	1.29e+08	25753724	2	6135	49808

Table 9. Water Leach Inventory Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\sigma^2_{\bar{y}}$	df	L	U
Al	5.21e+02	1.43e+05	2.87e+04	2	0.00	1.25e+03
Ca	3.38e+02	7.04e+03	1.41e+03	2	1.76e+02	4.99e+02
Fe	1.17e+03	3.66e+05	7.31e+04	2	4.87e+00	2.33e+03
Na	8.85e+04	1.31e+09	2.62e+08	2	1.88e+04	1.58e+05
Ni	6.79e+02	1.38e+05	2.76e+04	2	0.00	1.39e+03
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	2.17e+03	9.87e+06	1.97e+06	2	0.00	8.21e+03
P	1.01e+04	6.72e+07	1.34e+07	2	0.00	2.59e+04
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	$\sigma^2_{\bar{y}}$	df	L	U
Al	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ca	2.53e+02	4.68e+04	6.69e+03	3	0.00	5.13e+02
Fe	1.09e+03	2.42e+05	2.69e+04	4	6.37e+02	1.55e+03
Na	8.41e+04	7.63e+08	8.48e+07	4	5.85e+04	1.10e+05
Ni	6.62e+02	9.20e+04	1.02e+04	4	3.81e+02	9.43e+02
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	1.67e+03	5.62e+06	6.25e+05	4	0.00	3.87e+03
P	7.35e+03	5.50e+07	6.11e+06	4	4.86e+02	1.42e+04

09/05/2009 09:30:53

Table 10. Radio Chemistry Statistics ($\mu\text{Ci/g}$)

Element	\bar{y}	BMS	σ_y^2	df	L	U
Cs-137	747	8380.7	1676.14	2	571	924
Sr-90	2189	4742404	948480.5	2	0	6380
U	68.6	3886.215	1295.405	1	0.0	223.5
Pu-239/240	0.06	0.013323	0.002665	2	0.0	0.28
Pu-238	0.06	0.025023	0.005005	2	0.00	0.37

Table 11. Ion Chromatography Anion Statistics ($\mu\text{g/g}$)

Analyte	\bar{y}	BMS	σ_y^2	df	L	U
Cl	980	109000	21800	2	345	1615
NO ₂	47200	2.99e+08	59780000	2	13930	80470
NO ₃	62000	5.95e+08	1.19e+08	2	15080	108921
PO ₄	30760	5.86e+08	1.17e+08	2	0	77337
SO ₄	124040	20926000	4185200	2	115237	132843

Table 12. Homogenization Test Results

Analyte	Test: $\sigma_L^2=0$ p-value	% Variability due to:		
		segment	homogenization	analytical
Al	0.65	94.82	0.00	5.18
Ca	0.10	99.45	0.34	0.21
Fe	0.58	77.10	0.00	22.90
Na	0.72	92.95	0.00	7.05
Ni	0.42	99.17	0.04	0.79
P	0.26	96.55	0.74	2.71
Pb	0.22	99.73	0.87	2.40
U	0.08	99.55	0.21	0.24

Table 13. Segment versus Composite Statistics for Core 34

Analyte	\bar{y}_w	$\sigma^2(\bar{y}_w)$	composite	df*	95% C. I. for the SCC	
					L	U
Al	23549	52434015	29798	2	0	54708
Ca	25894	18916814	28984	8	15864	35923
Fe	13295	19518529	22848	8	3107	23483
Na #	87128	13536665	114891	9	78806	95451
Pb	3220	1101497	3326	3	0	6559
U	20098	6.98e+08	14369	5	0	88039
P	17318	6507390	21956	6	11076	23561
Cl #	963	4464	1300	6	799	1126
NO ₂	51875	18756838	62000	5	40740	63010
NO ₃	68125	27969779	80000	5	54528	81722
PO ₄	13200	33665294	19100	7	0	26922
SO ₄ #	12587	856924	15600	6	10322	14852
Cs-137	539	17666	750	9	238	840
Sr-90	2456	536927	3510	4	422	4490

significant difference between segment data and composite

units: $\mu\text{g/g}$: Al, Ca, Fe, Na, Pb, U, P, Cl, NO₂, NO₃, PO₄, SO₄
 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$: Cs-137, Sr-90

Table 14. Segment versus Composite Statistics for Core 36

Analyte	\bar{y}_w	\bar{y}_c	$\sigma^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$	df*	95% C. I. for difference	
					L	U
Al	4948	6410	4.29e+08	3	-67364	64439
Ca	15484	20391	51702254	5	-23393	13580
Fe	18355	26012	37595492	7	-22158	6844
Na	92724	120730	4.35e+08	2	-117756	61744
Pb	1788	1049	4355567	3	-5902	7379
U	96380	104910	2.13e+09	4	-136748	119688
P	24733	36761	71007390	2	-48288	24232
Cl	783	1050	58964	2	-1312	778
NO ₂	40750	52500	1.68e+08	3	-53025	29525
NO ₃	55667	71500	3.25e+08	2	-93463	61796
PO ₄	28858	49500	3.27e+08	2	-98414	57130
SO ₄	10600	13700	11319924	2	-17578	11377
Cs-137	559	793	21857	11	-559	92
Sr-90	384	508	2908128	3	-7462	7214

significant difference between segment data and composite

units: $\mu\text{g/g}$: Al, Ca, Fe, Na, Pb, U, P, Cl, NO₂, NO₃, PO₄, SO₄
 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$: Cs-137, Sr-90

Table 15. Acid Digestion Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_s^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
Al	3.67e+08	3.10e+07	7.85e+07	7.44e+09	9.93e+06	4.30e+08
Ca	2.49e+07	1.44e+06	6.26e+06	4.98e+08	4.62e+05	2.00e+07
Fe	0.00	2.76e+07	0.00	2.43e+08	8.85e+06	3.83e+08
Na	2.66e+08	2.39e+07	5.50e+07	5.42e+09	7.66e+06	3.32e+08
Ni	1.55e+07	1.06e+06	3.65e+06	3.11e+08	3.41e+05	1.48e+07
Pb	2.28e+06	2.41e+04	7.28e+05	4.47e+07	7.74e+03	3.35e+05
U	1.56e+09	1.10e+08	3.63e+08	3.14e+10	3.54e+07	1.53e+09
P	4.52e+07	3.83e+06	9.64e+06	9.17e+08	1.23e+06	5.32e+07
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_s^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
Al	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ca	9.29e+07	8.64e+05	3.84e+07	5.25e+08	3.37e+05	5.20e+06
Fe	1.30e+08	1.65e+07	4.02e+07	7.71e+08	6.45e+06	9.97e+07
Na	2.05e+08	1.44e+07	7.39e+07	1.19e+09	5.61e+06	8.67e+07
Ni	5.51e+07	6.38e+05	2.27e+07	3.12e+08	2.48e+05	3.84e+06
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	1.76e+09	6.61e+07	6.84e+08	1.01e+10	2.58e+07	3.98e+08
P	1.32e+08	2.30e+06	5.35e+07	7.47e+08	8.96e+05	1.39e+07

* approximate 95% confidence interval

Table 16. Water Leach Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates

Excluding Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_s^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
Al	7.06e+04	3.05e+04	0.00	1.73e+06	8.25e+03	1.20e+05
Ca	0.00	3.78e+04	0.00	6.16e+04	1.02e+04	1.50e+05
Fe	2.26e+05	3.43e+03	6.28e+04	4.45e+06	9.30e+02	1.36e+04
Na	5.01e+08	5.11e+08	0.00	1.57e+10	1.38e+08	2.02e+09
Ni	8.56e+04	1.29e+03	2.38e+04	1.68e+06	3.49e+02	5.09e+03
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	4.55e+06	2.60e+06	0.00	1.19e+08	7.03e+05	1.03e+07
P	3.50e+07	1.13e+07	0.00	8.12e+08	3.06e+06	4.46e+07
Including Drainable Liquid Composites						
Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_s^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_a^2	
			L	U	L	U
Al	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ca	1.26e+04	2.52e+04	0.00	2.19e+05	8.09e+03	3.44e+05
Fe	1.35e+05	1.74e+03	5.48e+04	7.66e+05	6.26e+02	1.45e+04
Na	2.86e+08	2.56e+08	0.00	2.29e+09	9.18e+07	2.13e+09
Ni	5.14e+04	6.53e+02	2.08e+04	2.91e+05	2.34e+02	5.44e+03
Pb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
U	2.43e+06	1.30e+06	0.00	1.72e+07	4.66e+05	1.08e+07
P	2.78e+07	5.64e+06	4.51e+06	1.71e+08	2.03e+06	4.70e+07

* approximate 95% confidence interval

Table 17. KOH/Ni Fusion Dissolution Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates

Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_a^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_s^2	
			L	U	L	U
Al	4.70e+08	566681	1.55e+08	9.17e+09	153572	22398455
Ca	40884317	155973	13086831	7.99e+08	42269	6164933
Fe	16463951	9811603	0.00	4.34e+08	2658971	3.88e+08
Na	5.24e+08	3961112	1.60e+08	1.03e+10	1073472	1.57e+08
Ni	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pb	3975509	147327	775277	7.92e+07	39926	5823204
U	1.78e+09	16386526	5.34e+08	3.49e+10	4440793	6.48e+08
P	80394573	137305	26371200	1.57e+09	37210	5427091

* approximate 95% confidence interval

Table 18. Radio Chemistry Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates

Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_a^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_s^2	
			L	U	L	U
Cs(137)	4949	463	0	101843	125	18281
Sr-90	3555783	1360	985902	57797174	369	53767
U		27573096			7472384	1.09e+09
Pu-239/240	0.008293	0.000054	2.57e-03	1.62e-01	0.000015	0.00213
Pu-238	0.015619	0.000032	5.10e-03	3.05e-01	0.000009	0.001265

* approximate 95% confidence interval

Table 19. Ion Chromatography Anion Spatial and Analytical Error Estimates

Analyte	σ_s^2	σ_a^2	95% C. I. for σ_a^2 *		95% C. I. for σ_s^2	
			L	U	L	U
Cl	52500	25000	0	1312401	6775	988142
NO ₂	1.04e+08	1.33e+08	0	3.56e+09	35907859	5.24e+09
NO ₃	2.21e+08	2.41e+08	0	7.09e+09	65176152	9.51e+09
PO ₃	2.97e+08	1.10e+08	0	7.07e+09	29894986	4.36e+09
SO ₄	9172500	6250000	0	2.51e+08	1693767	2.47e+08

* approximate 95% confidence interval

APPENDIX

This appendix contains the derivations of $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w)$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_w - \bar{y}_c)$. For the formulas in this appendix we define the following equalities: $\bar{y}_w = \bar{y}_{wi}$ and $\bar{y}_c = \bar{y}_{ci}$.

Three statistical models are used in the calculation of these two variance estimates. The first model, for the core and quarter segment data is

$$y_{ijk} = \mu + c_i + s_{ij} + e_{ijk}. \quad (1)$$

The mean of the two aliquots from the j^{th} quarter segment of the i^{th} core is \bar{y}_{ij} . A statistical model for this mean is

$$\bar{y}_{ij} = \mu + c_i + E_{ij} \quad (2)$$

where

\bar{y}_{ij} = mean of the two aliquots from the j^{th} quarter segment of the i^{th} core,

μ = overall mean of all the data,

c_i = the effect of the i^{th} core,

$E_{ij} = s_{ij} + \bar{e}_{ij}$,

s_{ij} = the effect of the j^{th} quarter segment in the i^{th} core, and

\bar{e}_{ij} = the residual of the j^{th} quarter segment mean in the i^{th} core.

The subscripts i , j , and k have the following ranges: $i=1, \dots, a$ (a =number of cores or core composites), $j=1, \dots, b_i$ (b_i = number of quarter segments in the i^{th} core), $k=1, \dots, n$ (n =number of aliquots taken from each quarter segment).

The third model, for core composite sample data is

$$y'_{ik} = \mu' + c'_i + e'_{ik} \quad (3)$$

where

y'_{ik} = k^{th} aliquot of the i^{th} core composite,

μ' = the overall mean of the all core composite aliquots,

c'_i = i^{th} core composite effect, and

e'_{ik} = k^{th} residual of the i^{th} core composite.

The subscript ranges are the same as those used for the previous model.

The variance of \bar{y}_{ij} is

$$\begin{aligned} V(\bar{y}_{ij}) &= V(\mu + c_i + E_{ij}) \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \sigma_s^2 + \sigma_c^2 \end{aligned}$$

where σ_c^2 is the variance between cores, σ_s^2 is the variance between quarter segments and σ^2 is the analytical error.

A weighted mean representing the simulated core composite (SCC) is

$$\bar{y}_{wi} = \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j \bar{y}_{ij}.$$

The variance of \bar{y}_{wi} is

$$\begin{aligned} V(\bar{y}_{wi}) &= V \left[\sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j \bar{y}_{ij} \right] = \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j^2 V(\bar{y}_{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j^2 \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \sigma_s^2 + \sigma_c^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The between mean squares (BMS) from model (2) has expectation

$$E(\text{BMS}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \sigma_s^2 + b_o \sigma_c^2$$

where

$$b_o = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^a b_i - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^a b_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^a b_i}}{a-1}.$$

The within mean squares (WMS) from model (2) has the expectation

$$E(WMS) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \sigma_s^2.$$

By solving a system of two equations with two unknowns, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_c^2 &= \frac{BMS - WMS}{b_o}, \\ \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{n} + \hat{\sigma}_s^2 &= WMS\end{aligned}$$

as estimates of σ_c^2 and $(\sigma^2/n + \sigma_s^2)$ respectively.

From the results above we can obtain an estimate of $\sigma^2(\bar{y}_{wi})$ which is

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}^2(\bar{y}_{wi}) &= \hat{V}(\bar{y}_{wi}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j^2 \left[\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{n} + \hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_c^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j^2 \left[WMS + \frac{BMS - WMS}{b_o} \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j^2 \left[\frac{BMS + (b_o - 1)WMS}{b_o} \right].\end{aligned}$$

The variance for $\bar{y}'_{i.}$, using the structure from model (3), is

$$V(\bar{y}'_{i.}) = \frac{\sigma^{2'} + n\sigma_c^{2'}}{n}$$

where $\sigma^{2'}$ is the analytical error and $\sigma_c^{2'}$ is the variability between cores. The between mean squares (BMS') expectation for model (3) is

$$E(BMS') = \sigma^{2'} + n\sigma_c^{2'}.$$

Using this expectation, an estimate of the variance for $\bar{y}'_{i.}$ is


$$\hat{V}(\bar{y}'_{i.}) = \frac{BMS'}{n}.$$

The estimated variance of $\bar{y}_{wi} - \bar{y}'_{i.}$ is


$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^2(\bar{y}_{wi} - \bar{y}'_{i.}) &= \sigma^2(\bar{y}_{wi}) + \sigma^2(\bar{y}'_{i.}) \\ &= \left[\sum_{j=1}^{b_i} w_j^2 \left(\frac{\text{BMS} + (b_o - 1)\text{WMS}}{b_o} \right) \right] + \left(\frac{\text{BMS}'}{n} \right).\end{aligned}$$

We have assumed that the covariance between the two means is zero.


Al (Composite and Segment Data)




Ca (Composite and Segment Data)




Fe (Composite and Segment Data)




Na (Composite and Segment Data)




Pb (Composite and Segment Data)




U (Composite and Segment Data)









P (Composite and Segment Data)




Chloride (Composite and Segment Data)









Al (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)




Ca (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)




Fe (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)




Na (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)




Ni (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)




Pb (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)



U (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)



P (Top and Bottom Quar. Segments Data)



APPENDIX C

MISCELLANEOUS DATA

This page intentionally left blank.

MEETING MINUTES

Subject: ENERGY MEASUREMENTS FOR DISQUALIFYING WASTE TANKS FROM WATCH LISTS

To: Distribution

BUILDING: MO-037

FROM: J. R. Jewett

Meeting Date

Number Attending

10/22/92

6

Distribution:

H. Babad	R2-08*	R. P. Marshall	T6-14
D. B. Bechtold	T6-50*	A. F. Noonan	R2-12
M. L. Bell	T6-16	J. C. Person	T6-50*
R. J. Cash	R2-32	J. P. Slougher	T6-07
D. A. Dodd	T6-50	H. E. Smith	R2-12*
D. J. Hert	T6-30*	J. H. Tillman	T6-30
J. R. Jewett	T6-50*	W. I. Winters	T6-50

XC GTD
 DW Jeppson
 DR Dickins
 RD Crowe
 GL BORSHEN
 MD CRIPPER
 RD SCHEELE
 GF SCHEFFELBE
 JD HOPKINS
 GD JOHNSON

* Attendees

R.J. CASH

JW OSBORNE

10/22/1992

CS WANG

BC SIMPSON

RECEIVED

J.E. HILL

Harry Babad is preparing to develop a criterion based on energetic measurements for removing tanks from the watch lists. He wants the labs to be prepared for the sample loads which may occur as a result of this criterion. Initial thoughts about the criterion are as follows:

If the exotherm of the material is < 75 cal/g, there should be no further concern. If moisture is $> 25\%$, the limit of concern may be raised to 125 cal/g. These are figures determined by Babad in consultation with a number of nationally recognized experts in the field.

The suggestion is that if the differential scanning calorimetry exotherms exceed this level, then more in-depth examination, such as adiabatic calorimetry, would be necessary. Adiabatic calorimetry would give such information as initiation temperature, reaction rate, and propagation rate. Babad estimates that perhaps there might be 20 tanks that exceed these limits. (This number is, of course, open to debate.) There would also be need for measurements to support studies of synthetic materials.

A number of deficiencies of adiabatic calorimetry and thoughts about improvement were mentioned during the meeting. Keeping in spirit of the meeting, which was by and large a brain storming session, the ideas are presented here in no particular order.

1. Do we have enough tools? Adiabatic is slow, labor intensive, dose rate high. It uses too much sample; we have just one. Does the Accelerating Rate Calorimeter (ARC; by Columbia Scientific) offer any advantage over the Fauske Reactive System Screening Tool? If it is too big, could it be modified?

2. Do we have the right tools to work up the results? We should have a bigger computer. Would Chemometric tools help? (Eric Wyse at PNL may have an idea.) Could data work-up be more automated?
3. Do we have enough capacity?
4. Do we have proper documentation for our measurements? We use test plans and test reports now. When sample load increases, we will need to use a fast efficient system to get data to engineers, programs, and external customers. The "data package" system used for single-shell tank characterization is not fast enough.
5. We need to develop back-ups to current thermal analysis staff.
6. We need to have a low-temperature drying method for adiabatic samples that is controlled well enough to allay any suspicion that the samples lose their chemical energy before the actual adiabatic measurement.

No formal actions were taken or assigned at this meeting. These minutes are issued as a way to raise general awareness that needs for direct measurement of waste sample energetics has the potential for dramatic growth. The laboratory should be prepared with respect to knowledge of methods, manpower, and equipment.

Westinghouse
Hanford Company

Internal
Memo

From: Waste Characterization Analysis
Phone: 6-1639 H0-34
Date: March 23, 1993
Subject: HEAT LOAD DETERMINATION OF TANK 241-C-112

23230-93-JMM-010

To: B. C. Simpson R2-12
cc: R. J. Cash R2-32
W. L. Knecht H0-34
JMM File/LB

On February 2, 1993, you requested that I perform a heat load determination on tank 241-C-112. You provided the thermocouple readings and placement depths. Accordingly, an analysis was performed. The value determined for the heat load of the tank was 8,100 Btu/h (2.374 kW). The conductivity of the waste was determined to be .70 Btu/h-ft-°F. The accuracy limits of the heat load determination were considered to be plus or minus 1,000 Btu/h.

The analysis utilized the data you provided as the primary data. The boundary conditions for the surrounding soil were a conductivity of .6 Btu/h-ft-°F, and a constant temperature of 55 °F at 200 feet below the soil surface, and a forced convection heat sink of 54 °F at the soil surface. These values are those used in previous analyses, except for the soil conductivity, which is that for slightly better than 10% saturated sand. This value is the best estimate of soil conductivity to date. A copy of the workbook is included in this letter.


J. M. McLaren
Senior Engineer


Checked by:


G. K. Allen
Principal Engineer

bab

Attachment

CONCURRENCE:


W. L. Knecht, Manager
Waste Characterization Analysis


Tank 241-C-112 workbook

Brett Simpson called and wanted a heat load on tank C-112. I have acquired prints H-2-37912, Riser Elevations, and H-2-1744, Tank Farm Riser and Nozzle Elevations. I also have print W-7387, 75 Ft Diameter Tanks Building No. 241 Concrete Details of Tank. Drawing W-7387 shows that the distance from the bottom of the tank wall to the top of the liner is 18 ft, and the distance from the top of the liner to the bottom center of the dome is 12 ft. The distance from the center of the bottom to the bottom of the tank wall is 1 ft, as is the thickness of the concrete dome. Drawing H-2-1744 shows the same dimensions, except for the distance from the top of the liner to the bottom center of the dome, which is not shown at all. The drawing shows that the elevation of the bottom center of the tank is 608 ft, and the elevation of the top of the risers on the south side is 646.12 ft, and on the north side 645.69 ft. The average elevation is 645.91 ft.

The distance to the top of the tank from the bottom is $1 + 18 + 12 + 1$ ft = 32 ft. The elevation is $608 + 32 = 640$ ft. The depth of the dirt cover is $645.91 - 640 = 5.91$ ft. This is a little less than usually considered. The depth of soil cover is usually from 7 to 9 feet. Drawing H-2-37912 shows that the bottom elevation of the tank is 607.00 ft. This would give a soil cover depth of 6.91 ft. I think that this is more probable, and that print H-2-37912 is more accurate than H-2-1744 in this respect. So I will use a depth of 6.91 ft.

The model will be developed by modifying the C-109 model I built for the heat load analysis for WHC-SD-WM-ER-139, Heat Load and Thermal Characteristics Determination for Selected Tanks. The development of the C-109 model is covered in detail in WHC-SD-WM-TI-502, the Task Record (Engineering Notebook) for the above report. This model's nodding diagram is shown as on Page 2. The first thing to do is to get the top and bottom dimensions correct. From measurements taken from Drawing W-7387, the top of the tank dome is 22.89 ft above the reference line. The program VOLUME2.BAS was developed to calculate the volume of the tank above and below the drawing reference line for various radii. This program is shown on Page 3, and the input tables are shown on Page 4. Running VOLUME2.BAS for the radii 0 to 10.11 ft gives an average height of 22.62 ft. The difference is .27 ft. So the underside of the tank top is $6.91 + 1$ (concrete thickness) = 7.91 ft below the surface of the soil. The elevation of the region is $7.91 + .27 = 8.18$ ft. The model showed 8.05

TANK 241-C-109 MODEL



Tank 241-C-112 workbook

```
5 DIM D(39), R(39)
10 PRINT "IS DATA ABOVE OR BELOW REFERENCE LINE?"
15 INPUT A$
20 OPEN "C:DATA.R" FOR INPUT AS #1
25 IF A$="ABOVE" THEN GOTO 45
26 IF A$="above" THEN GOTO 45
30 OPEN "C:DATA.D" FOR INPUT AS #2
35 GOSUB 145
40 GOTO 55
45 OPEN "C:DATA.H" FOR INPUT AS #2
50 GOSUB 145
55 INPUT "RADIUS FROM" ; A
60 INPUT "          TO" ; B
65 V=0!
70 FOR I=1 TO 39: IF A=R(I) THEN J=I
75 NEXT I
80 FOR I=1 TO 39: IF B=R(I) THEN K=I
85 NEXT I
90 FOR I=J+1 TO K
95 R1=R(I-1): R2=R(I)
100 D1=D(I-1): D2=D(I)
105 RAVG=R2^2-R1^2
110 DAVG=(D2+D1)/2
115 V=V+RAVG*DAVG
120 NEXT I
125 VOL=V*3.14159
130 DEPTH=VOL/((B^2-A^2)*3.14159)
135 PRINT "VOLUME IS          DEPTH IS"
136 PRINT VOL;" FT3      ";DEPTH;" FT"
140 END
145 FOR I=1 TO 39
150 INPUT#1,R(I)
155 INPUT#2,D(I)
160 NEXT I
165 RETURN
```


INPUT FOR VOLUME2.BAS

RADIUS	DEPTH BELOW REFERENCE	HEIGHT ABOVE REFERENCE
0.	7.43	22.89
1.01	7.43	22.89
2.02	7.43	22.89
3.03	7.39	22.89
4.04	7.38	22.84
5.05	7.38	22.79
6.06	7.35	22.74
7.08	7.33	22.64
8.09	7.33	22.54
9.10	7.33	22.39
10.11	7.30	22.29
11.12	7.28	22.14
12.13	7.26	22.01
13.14	7.23	21.83
14.15	7.20	21.63
15.16	7.18	21.48
16.17	7.13	21.28
17.18	7.13	21.02
18.19	7.08	20.77
19.20	7.05	20.57
20.22	7.02	20.27
21.23	6.97	20.01
22.24	6.92	19.76
23.25	6.87	19.46
24.26	6.82	19.15
25.27	6.77	18.85
26.28	6.72	18.45
27.29	6.67	18.14
28.30	6.62	17.74
29.31	6.57	17.33
30.32	6.52	16.93
31.33	6.45	16.53
32.35	6.42	16.12
33.36	6.36	15.46
34.37	6.25	14.81
35.38	5.86	14.10
36.39	5.10	13.19
37.40	3.54	12.13
37.50	0.	12.08

ft. So change all the dome regions by $8.18 - 8.05 = .13$ ft. The bottom is done similarly. VOLUME2.BAS calculates the average depth below the reference line for the radii 0 to 12.13 ft to be 7.33 ft. The bottom center is 7.43 ft. the difference is $7.33 - 7.43 = -.10$ ft. The tank bottom is $645.91 - 607 = 38.91$ ft. The depth of the region of the tank bottom center is $38.91 - .10 = 38.81$ ft. The difference between the two tank bottom regions is $47.96 - 47.10 = .86$ ft. So the second region is at $38.81 - .86 = 37.95$ ft. These regions are .5 ft thick.

So now construct the model. Using the nodding diagram on Page 2, add .13 to all the vertical dimension values in the airspace regions. The tank bottom vertical dimensions will be 38.81 to 39.31 for the lower tank bottom, and 37.95 to 38.45 for the outer (upper) tank bottom. All the waste regions above the tank bottom can be consolidated into one region, for two waste regions, the one over the "step" in the bottom, and the one above the entire bottom. Also, in the interest of better continuity, renumber all the regions.


To determine the waste depth for the model, take the provided data which shows a depth of 3.79 ft. This is measured at the outer riser location, taken to be 33.5 ft from the tank center. At that location the measurements from drawing W-7387 show the tank bottom to be 6.36 ft below the reference line. The center position is 7.43 feet below the reference line, a difference of 1.07 ft. There is a difference of $6.36 - 3.79 = 2.57$ ft between the measured top of the sludge and the reference line. Running VOLUME2.BAS for the volume below the reference line gives a volume of 28991 ft³. With a tank diameter of 75 ft and a height of 2.57 ft, there is a volume of 11353.91 ft³ between the reference line and the top of the sludge. This means there is $28991.75 - 11353.91 = 17637.84$ ft³ of sludge. Region 23 of the model, the small sludge volume at the center bottom is 12.13 ft in radius and .86 ft high for a volume of 397.53 ft³. This means there is $17637.84 - 397.53 = 17240.31$ ft³ of sludge in Region 22. This region is 3.90 ft high. So the top of the sludge is at $37.95 - 3.90 = 34.05$ ft. The thermocouple positions should be placed to be correct when measured from the top of the sludge. There will be an error of .11 ft at the bottom, but this should be acceptable. The nodding diagram is shown on Page 6

Now to work up the data. The temperature data from the T/C trees in Risers 1 and 5 is shown on Page 7, with the elevations of the individual thermocouples on Page 8. Plots of the data, with the data locations measured from the sludge surface are shown on Page 9. The averages will be used to make the data string to be matched.

Now start the iteration process. From the temperature data I will start at 7500 BTU/hr, and use a waste conductivity of .65 BTU/hr-ft-°F. The run shows this is pretty low. Try again at 9000 BTU/hr. This one is too high, but in the ballpark. Drop down to 7750 BTU/hr. This one shows we're getting close. Try 8000 BTU/hr. Real close. Now change the conductivity to something a little higher to better match the slope of the data. Try .70 BTU/hr-ft-°F. Just about dead on. Looks like the power is 8000 BTU/hr with a conductivity of .7 BTU/hr-ft-°F. Plots of the results of these runs are shown on Page 10. The accuracy spread is the spread of the data. A 7000 BTU/hr run is plotted with the 8000 BTU/hr run and the 9000 BTU/hr run, against the data on page 12. Looks like a ± 1000 BTU/hr will do the trick. So I will use that.

9025-5456-65
993945-2205

TANK 241-C-112 MODEL



9313045-0288

0003

TEMPERATURE DATA - TANK 112-C

MONITORING SCHEDULE: WEEKLY
FERROCYANIDETEMPERATURES - °FAHRENHEIT
(* indicates bad data)

THERMOCOUPLES

DATE	TIME	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	REMARKS
01/02/93	1	80		77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	73	J 890523512-47
	2	80	80	79	78	78	78	78	78	78	77		K 90226246-45
01/17/93	1	81		78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	74	J 890523512-47
	2	80	80	79	77	77	77	77	77	77	77		K 910226246-19
01/23/93	2	82	81	77	78	78	78	78	77	77	78		K 910226246-34
01/24/93	1	82		79	79	79	79	79	78	78	78	74	J 890523512-20

2750 E LOBBY I --- ENG APPS
App C-10

02/01/93 10:30 508 373 4095

MHC-EP-0640 Rev. 1
Tank 241-C-112 un-bulk

G. L. Borsheim, et al.,
Page 9 of 10
May 20, 1992


241-C-112, Riser 1, Existing Probe		Waste Level = 3.79 feet	
Thermocouple #	Relative Elevation (ft)	Monitor by TMACS	
1	1.7	Yes	
2	3.7	Yes	
3	5.7	Yes	
4	7.7		No
5	9.7		No
6	11.7		No
7	13.7		No
8	15.7	Yes	
9	17.7		No
10	21.7		No
11	25.7		No

24"
spacing

241-C-112, Riser 5, New Probe		Waste Level = 3.79 feet	
Thermocouple #	Relative Elevation (ft)	Monitor by TMACS	
1	1.3	Yes	
2	2.1	Yes	
3	3.0	Yes	
4	3.8	Yes	
5	4.6	Yes	
6	7.4		No
7	9.5		No
8	11.6		No
9	13.6		No
10	15.7	Yes	


10"
spacing

TANK 241-C-112 HEAT LOAD DATA COMPARISONS FOR RISERS 1 AND 5




APP C-12

TANK 241-C-112 HEAT LOAD



TANK 241-C-112 HEAT LOAD



APP C-14

MHC-EP-0640 Rev. 1
Table 1: SST Core 34, Sample Numbers

SST CORE 34 SAMPLE NUMBERS						
Sample Prep Method	Sample ID	Primary	Duplicate	Spike	Spike Control	Methods Blank
FUSION						
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C34-1D	92-06733-A-1	92-06733-A-2			92-06733-A-3
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C34-2B	92-06734-A-1	92-06734-A-2			92-06734-A-3
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C34-2C	92-06735-A-1	92-06735-A-2			92-06735-A-3
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C34-2D	92-06736-A-1	92-06736-A-2			92-06736-A-3
ICP/Radchem (a)	C34 Composite	92-06740-B-1	92-06740-B-2			92-06740-B-3
ACID DIGESTION						
ICP/GEA	C34-2C Top	92-06729-A	92-06729-B			92-06745
ICP/GEA	C34-2C Bottom	92-06730-A	92-06730-B			
ICP/GEA	C34-2D Top	92-06731-A	92-06731-B			92-06746
ICP/GEA	C34-2D Bottom	92-06732-A	92-06732-B			
ICP	C34 Composite	92-06740-A-1	92-06740-A-2			92-06740-A-3
ICP	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-A-1	92-06747-A-2	92-06747-A-3	92-06747-A-4	92-06747-A-5
AA/Radchem (a)	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-B-1	92-06747-B-2	92-06747-B-3	92-06747-B-4	92-06747-B-5
Radchem (a)	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-B-6	92-06747-B-7			92-06747-B-8
WATER LEACH						
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C34-1D	92-06733-B-1	92-06733-B-2	92-06733-B-3	92-06733-B-4	92-06733-B-5
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C34-2B	92-06734-B-1	92-06734-B-2	92-06734-B-3	92-06734-B-4	92-06734-B-5
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C34-2C	92-06735-B-1	92-06735-B-2	92-06735-B-3	92-06735-B-4	92-06735-B-5
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C34-2D	92-06736-B-1	92-06736-B-2	92-06736-B-3	92-06736-B-4	92-06736-B-5
ICP/IC/Inorg/Radchem (a)	C34 Composite	92-06740-C-1	92-06740-C-2			92-06740-C-3 (b)
ICP/IC/Inorg/Radchem (a)	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-C-1	92-06747-C-2	92-06747-C-3	92-06747-C-4	92-06747-C-5
MERCURY	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-D-1	92-06747-D-2	92-06767-D-3	92-06767-D-4	92-06767-D-5
SEMI-VOLATILE ORG	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-E-1	92-06747-E-2	92-06747-E-3	92-06747-E-4	
TOX	C34 Liquid Composite	92-06747-F-1	92-06747-F-2	92-06747-F-3		92-06747-F-4
TOC/TIC/TC						
	C34-1D	92-06733-C-1	92-06733-C-2			92-06733-C-3
	C34-2B	92-06734-C-1	92-06734-C-2			92-06734-C-3
	C34-2C	92-06735-C-1	92-06735-C-2			92-06735-C-3
	C34-2D	92-06736-C-1	92-06736-C-2			92-06736-C-3
WT% SOLIDS						
	C34-1D	92-06733-D-1	92-06733-D-2			
	C34-2B	92-06734-D-1	92-06734-D-2			
	C34-2C	92-06735-D-1	92-06735-D-2			
	C34-2D	92-06736-D-1	92-06736-D-2			
	C34 Composite	92-06740-D-1	92-06740-D-2			
DSC/TGA						
	C34-2B	92-06741				
	C34-2C	92-06742				
	C34-2D	92-06743				
	C34 Composite	92-06740				
Particle Size	C34-2D	92-06728				

(a) Baseline SST Suite of radiochem analyses

(b) ALO Number 92-06761-B-5 was used as the methods blank for some analytes

Table I-1: SST Core 35, PNL-ALO Sample Numbers

SST CORE 35 PNL-ALO SAMPLE NUMBERS						
Sample Prep Method	Sample ID	Primary	Duplicate	Spike	Spike Control	Methods Blank
FUSION						
ICP/RadChem	C35-2D & Composite	92-08169-A-1	92-08169-A-2			92-08169-A-3
ACID DIGESTION						
ICP/GEA	C35-2D Top	92-08167-A	92-08167-B			* 92-06776
ICP/GEA	C35-2D Bottom	92-08168-A	92-08168-B			
ICP	C35 Composite	92-08169-F-1	92-08169-F-2			92-06774-A-3
Sb/ICP	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-A-1	92-06774-A-2	92-06774-A-4	92-06774-A-5	92-06774-A-3
Radchem	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-B-1	92-06774-B-2			92-06774-B-3
AA	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-B-6	92-06774-B-7	92-06774-B-9	92-06774-B-10	92-06774-B-8
WATER LEACH						
TOC/ICP/IC/Inorg/Radchem	C35-2D & Composite	92-08169-B-1	92-08169-B-2	92-08169-B-3	92-08169-B-4	92-08169-B-5
TOC/ICP/IC/Inorg/Radchem	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-C-1	92-06774-C-2	92-06774-C-4	92-06774-C-5	92-06774-C-3 (a)
MERCURY	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-D-1	92-06774-D-2	92-06774-D-4	92-06774-D-5	92-06774-D-3
SEMIVOLATILE ORG	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-E-1	92-06774-E-2	92-06774-E-4	92-06774-E-5	92-06774-E-3
TOX	C35 Liquid Composite	92-06774-F-1	92-06774-F-2	92-06774-F-4		92-06774-F-3
TOC/TIC/TC	C35-2D	92-08169-C-1	92-08169-C-2			92-08169-C-3
C-14	C35-2D	92-08169-J-1	92-08169-J-2			92-08169-J-3
WT% SOLIDS	C35-2D	92-08169-D-1	92-08169-D-2			
DSC/TGA	C35-2D	92-08170				
Particle Size	C35-2D	92-06773				
(a) 92-08969-B5 or 92-08169-B5 were used as the methods blank for some analytes						

Table I-1: SST Core 36, PNL-ALO Sample Numbers

SST CORE 36 PNL SAMPLE NUMBERS						
Sample Prep Method	Sample ID	Primary	Duplicate	Spike	Spike Control	Methods Blank
FUSION						
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C36-1C	92-06761-A-1	92-06761-A-2			92-06761-A-5
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C36-1D	92-06762-A-1	92-06762-A-2			
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C36-2A	92-06763-A-1	92-06763-A-2			
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C36-2B	92-06764-A-1	92-06764-A-2			92-06764-A-5
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C36-2C	92-06765-A-1	92-06765-A-2			
ICP/GEA/Sr-90	C36-2D	92-06766-A-1	92-06766-A-2			
ICP/Radchem	C36 Composite	92-06767-H-1	92-06767-H-2			92-06767-H-4
ACID DIGESTION						
ICP/GEA	C36-1C Top	92-06757-A	92-06757-B			92-06769
ICP/GEA	C36-1C Bottom	92-06758-A	92-06758-B			
ICP/GEA	C36-2D Top	92-06759-A	92-06759-B			92-06770
ICP/GEA	C36-2D Bottom	92-06760-A	92-06760-B			
ICP/Sb	C36 Composite	92-06767-A-1	92-06767-A-2	92-06767-A-3	92-06767-A-4	92-06767-A-5
AA/Radchem	C36 Composite	92-06767-B-1	92-06767-B-2	92-06767-B-3	92-06767-B-4	92-06767-B-5
WATER LEACH						
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C36-1C	92-06761-B-1	92-06761-B-2	92-06761-B-3*	92-06761-B-4*	92-06761-B-5
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C36-1D	92-06762-B-1	92-06762-B-2			
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C36-2A	92-06763-B-1	92-06763-B-2			
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C36-2B	92-06764-B-1	92-06764-B-2			
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C36-2C	92-06765-B-1	92-06765-B-2			
IC/CN/GEA/pH	C36-2D	92-06766-B-1	92-06766-B-2			
ICP/IC/Inorg/Radchem	C36 Composite	92-06767-C-1	92-06767-C-2	92-06767-C-3*	92-06767-C-4*	92-06767-C-5
MERCURY	C36 Composite	92-06767-D-1	92-06767-D-2	92-06767-D-3	92-06767-D-4	92-06767-D-5
VOLATILE ORG	C36-SEG1	92-06750-A-1	92-06750-A-2			92-06750-A-5
SEMI-VOLATILE ORG	C36 Composite	92-06767-E-1	92-06767-E-2	92-06767-E-3	92-06767-E-4	92-06767-E-5
ECX	C36 Composite	92-06767-F-1	92-06767-F-2	92-06767-F-3		92-06767-F-4
TOC/TIC/TC						
	C36-1C	92-06761-C-1	92-06761-C-2			
	C36-1D	92-06762-C-1	92-06762-C-2			
	C36-2A	92-06763-C-1	92-06763-C-2			
	C36-2B	92-06764-C-1	92-06764-C-2			
	C36-2C	92-06765-C-1	92-06765-C-2			
	C36-2D	92-06766-C-1	92-06766-C-2			
	C36 Composite	92-06767-C-1	92-06767-C-2			92-06767-C-5
TOC/TIC/TC & C-14	C36 Composite	92-06767-J-1	92-06767-J-2			92-06767-J-3
WT% SOLIDS						
	C36-1C	92-06761-D-1	92-06761-D-2			
	C36-1D	92-06762-D-1	92-06762-D-2			
	C36-2A	92-06763-D-1	92-06763-D-2			
	C36-2B	92-06764-D-1	92-06764-D-2			
	C36-2C	92-06765-D-1	92-06765-D-2			
	C36-2D	92-06766-D-1	92-06766-D-2			
	C36 Composite	92-06767-K-1	92-06767-K-2			
DSC/TGA						
	C36-1C	92-06761				
	C36-1D	92-06762				
	C36-2A	92-06763				
	C36-2B	92-06764				
	C36-2C	92-06765				
	C36-2D	92-06766				
	C36 Composite	92-06767				
Particle Size	C36-SEG1	92-06749				
Rheology	C36-SEG2	92-09725				

* Sample for IC only

This page intentionally left blank.

620-54676
99345-227

APPENDIX D
QUALITY ASSURANCE DOCUMENTATION SUMMARY

This page intentionally left blank.

9305-0205
9305-0205
9305-0205

Table 7a: SST Core 34, ICP Core Composite Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Ni Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 06/15/92
M&TE: WA55672Samp Log#: 92-674081
Dilution: 1.0092-674083
1.00ug/g Factor 3120.2
ICP Run # 8293120.2
828***Estimated***
DL QL

	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)
Ag	<DL						<DL		0.0078	0.0261
Al	29798.4						<DL		0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL						<DL		0.1014	0.3379
B	<DL						<DL		0.0596	0.1987
Ba	96.8						(38.1)		0.0080	0.0267
Be	<DL						<DL		0.0032	0.0107
Ca	28983.6						<DL		0.0016	0.0054
Cd	(23.4)						<DL		0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL						<DL		0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL						<DL		0.1865	0.6217
Cr	320.4						<DL		0.0113	0.0378
Cu	(64.4)						(44.3)		0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL						<DL		0.0053	0.0176
Fe	1522847.4						27331.9		0.0100	0.0334
K	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.3173	1.0576
La	(113.2)						<DL		0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL						<DL		0.0074	0.0246
Mg	514.8						29.7		0.0003	0.0009
Mn	327.0						91.7		0.0010	0.0034
Mo	(44.3)						<DL		0.0128	0.0427
Nb	114890.8						1857.4		0.0587	0.1957
Nd	(254.6)						<DL		0.0496	0.1653
Ni	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.0231	0.0768
Pb	3325.6						<DL		0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL						<DL		0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL						<DL		0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL						<DL		0.0350	0.1167
Sb	<DL						<DL		0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL						<DL		0.1515	0.5050
Si	3157.1						<DL		0.0549	0.1830
Sr	241.3						<DL		0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL						<DL		0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL						<DL		0.0734	0.2448
Ti	99.4						<DL		0.0054	0.0179
Tl	<DL						<DL		0.5492	1.8308
U	14369.0						<DL		0.5376	1.7920
V	(33.0)						<DL		0.0090	0.0301
Zn	293.9						54.6		0.0041	0.0136
Zr	<DL						<DL		0.0076	0.0253
P	21955.9						<DL		0.6133	2.0442
Bf										

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/15/92

07/28/92

Table 7b: SST Core 34, ICP Quarter Segments 1d & 2B Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Ni Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 06/01/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6733A1	92-6733A2	92-6734A1	92-6734A2	92-6733A3	92-6734A3		
Dilution:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
ug/g Factor	5239.1	5306.7						
ICP Run #	742	743						
			20%		20%			***Estimated***
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	RPO Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	RPO Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)
	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Al	19074.2	16222.2	16.2%	32483.9	32241.4	0.7%	<DL	<DL
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
B	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ba	(82.7)	(79.9)	3.5%	(103.0)	(136.7)	28.1%	(50.8)	(46.6)
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ca	26041.3	30356.8	15.3%	21619.8	21786.8	0.8%	712.0	714.2
Cd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Cr	(191.3)	(188.6)	1.4%	209.3	(202.3)	3.4%	<DL	<DL
Cu	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Fe	8742.8	8297.1	5.2%	14862.2	14591.6	1.8%	(75.2)	(62.1)
K	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
La	<DL	<DL		(84.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Mg	446.8	494.9	10.2%	441.5	486.7	9.7%	59.3	58.9
Mn	169.2	173.5	2.5%	302.0	317.2	4.9%	18.2	(14.6)
Mo	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Na	90862.3	91100.8	0.3%	86858.0	91136.4	4.8%	1131.0	1226.4
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ni	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
Pb	1494.5	(1073.3)	32.8%	3768.3	3476.7	8.0%	<DL	<DL
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Sb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Si	1357.8	1132.6	18.1%	3138.8	3276.5	4.3%	<DL	<DL
Sr	166.6	137.0	19.5%	274.5	271.5	1.1%	<DL	<DL
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Ti	(54.9)	128.8	80.4%	(57.3)	<DL		<DL	<DL
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
U	<DL	<DL		(2963.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
Zn J	211.7	174.6	19.2%	J 238.5	287.9	18.8%	162.1	149.5
Zr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL
P	11987.3	13523.3	12.0%	11551.1	(10696)	7.7%	<DL	<DL
Bl								

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > DL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/01/92

07/28/92

Table 7c: SST Core 34, ICP Quarter Segments 2C & 2D Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Ni Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 06/03/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6735A1	92-6735A2		92-6736A1	92-6736A2		92-6735A3	92-6736A3	
Dilution:	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
ug/g Factor	5817.7	4628.4		4921.9	5005.0		5057.4	5057.4	***Estimated***
ICP Run #	762	763		764	765		761	766	DL QL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL) (ug/mL)
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078 0.0261
Al J	14143.1	20495.0	36.7% *	26417.7	27318.2	3.4%	<DL	<DL	0.1829 0.6096
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014 0.3379
B	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0596 0.1987
Ba	(99.1)	(90.0)	9.7%	(114.2)	(111.9)	2.1%	(53.3)	(55.1)	0.0080 0.0267
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032 0.0107
Ca	30637.8	29141.6	5.0%	23631.2	23936.0	1.3%	424.9	431.0	0.0016 0.0054
Cd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0075 0.0250
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019 0.3396
Co	<DL	(1071.5)		(1226.3)	(1138.8)	7.4%	<DL	(1173.6)	0.1865 0.6217
Cr	235.5	278.4	16.7%	224.8	231.2	2.8%	<DL	<DL	0.0113 0.0378
Cu	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0088 0.0294
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053 0.0176
Fe	9797.9	10701.3	8.8%	18482.6	20886.7	12.2%	(106.5)	(102.3)	0.0100 0.0334
K	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.3173 1.0576
La	<DL	<DL		(75.7)	(77.4)	2.2%	<DL	<DL	0.0124 0.0414
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074 0.0246
Mg	440.3	457.9	3.9%	475.5	478.4	0.6%	48.4	48.1	0.0003 0.0009
Mn	161.7	170.3	5.2%	238.7	248.7	4.1%	18.7	19.7	0.0010 0.0034
Mo	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0128 0.0427
Na J	79271.9	100680.6	23.8% *	78902.4	78213.4	0.9%	1465.1	1823.2	0.0587 0.1957
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0496 0.1653
Ni	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.0231 0.0768
Pb	(1113.3)	(1185.2)	6.3%	2791.1	2842.0	1.8%	<DL	<DL	0.0831 0.2771
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173 0.0576
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821 0.2738
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350 0.1167
Sb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475 0.1584
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515 0.5050
Si	1305.8	1583.2	19.2%	2755.9	3044.3	9.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0549 0.1830
Sr	150.9	147.1	2.5%	185.9	189.1	1.7%	<DL	<DL	0.0004 0.0013
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950 0.3168
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734 0.2448
Ti J	(56.8)	(79.6)	33.5%	98.4	106.4	7.8%	<DL	<DL	0.0054 0.0179
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492 1.8308
U J	(4856.6)	(6459.8)	28.3%	20463.6	19732.3	3.6%	<DL	<DL	0.5376 1.7920
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090 0.0301
Zn J	241.4	233.3	3.4%	281.5	342.8	19.6%	73.8	74.8	0.0041 0.0136
Zr	<DL	<DL		(67.0)	(53.7)	22.0%	<DL	<DL	0.0076 0.0253
P	19737.8	19752.0	0.1%	19808.9	19101.0	3.6%	<DL	<DL	0.6133 2.0442
Bi									

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/03/92

07/28/92

000-5406166

ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34

Table 6a: SST Core 34, ICP-Drainable Liquid-Acid Digestion Sample Results

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** Sample Results *****

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 06/09/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 1 of 2

Samp Log#: 92-06747a1			92-06747a2			92-06747a5			***Estimated***	
Dilution: 1.00			1.00			1.00			DL	QL
ug/g Factor 168.24			165.26			166.26				
ICP Run # 794			793			791				
	Sample		Sample		Dupl.	Dupl.	Blank	Blank		
	ug/g	%Dif	ug/g	%Dif	ug/g	%Dif	ug/g	ug/g	%Dif	
Ag	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0078	0.0261
Al	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.1014	0.3379
B	<DL		<DL		<DL		98.8		0.0596	0.1987
Ba	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0080	0.0267
Be	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0032	0.0107
Ca	<DL		<DL		<DL		309.1		0.0016	0.0054
Cd	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.1865	0.6217
Cr	162.3		160.7		(2.4)		<DL		0.0113	0.0378
Cu	(1.9)		(2.1)		<DL		<DL		0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0053	0.0176
Fe	1042.0		1046.6		12.8		<DL		0.0100	0.0334
K	518.9		509.8		<DL		<DL		0.3173	1.0576
La	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0074	0.0246
Mg	2.0		0.5		51.7		<DL		0.0003	0.0009
Mn	1.2		(0.5)		(0.5)		<DL		0.0010	0.0034
Mo	26.6		27.6		<DL		<DL		0.0128	0.0427
Na	82110.9		82620.6		196.7		<DL		0.0587	0.1957
Nd	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0496	0.1653
Ni	634.6		633.8		<DL		<DL		0.0231	0.0768
Pb	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0350	0.1167
Sb	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.1515	0.5050
Si	(21.0)		38.3		163.1		<DL		0.0549	0.1830
Sr	<DL		<DL		1.1		<DL		0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0734	0.2448
Ti	<DL		<DL		(1.8)		<DL		0.0054	0.0179
Tl	(228.6)		(180.7)		<DL		<DL		0.5492	1.8308
U	1129.4		1125.2		<DL		<DL		0.5376	1.7920
V	<DL		<DL		<DL		<DL		0.0090	0.0301
Zn	2.7		(2.2)		9.8		<DL		0.0041	0.0136
Zr	<DL		<DL		(2.1)		<DL		0.0076	0.0253
P	3649.9		3654.3		<DL		<DL		0.6133	2.0442
Bi										

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) The process "Blank" has been subtracted from the "Sample & Duplicate" results.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/09/92

08/13/92

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34

Table 6b: SST Core 34, ICP-Drainable Liquid-Acid Digestion QC Results

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** QC Results *****

Analyzed: 06/09/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 2 of 2

Samp Log#: 92-06747a3
Dilution: 1.00
ug/g Factor: 165.32
ICP Run #: 792

92-06747a4
1.00
100.00
791

Ave a1&a2 ug/g	RPD RPD Flg	Spike Added					Spike Control				
		Spike Added ug/g	Spike+ Sample ug/g	Spike+ Sample ug/g	% Dif	% Rec	Spike STD ug/mL	Spike Control ug/mL	Spike Control ug/mL	% Dif	% Rec
Ag	N/A	82.52	68.7			83.2%	50.0	46.3			92.6%
Al	N/A	412.59	388.8			94.2%	250.0	248.5			99.4%
As	N/A	330.07	307.1			93.1%	200.0	199.4			99.7%
B	N/A		<DL								
Ba	N/A	82.52	78.9			95.6%	50.0	49.6			99.3%
Be	N/A	8.25	7.7			93.0%	5.0	4.8			95.8%
Ca	N/A	825.18	788.2			95.5%	500.0	513.0			102.6%
Cd	N/A	41.26	38.8			94.1%	25.0	24.2			96.7%
Ce	N/A		<DL								
Co	N/A		<DL								
Cr	161.5 0.9%	82.52	240.5			95.7%	50.0	53.1			106.2%
Cu	2.0 9.5%		(2.1)								
Dy	N/A		<DL								
Fe	1044.3 0.4%	82.52	1181.3			166.1% #	50.0	50.8			101.7%
K	514.3 1.8%	1650.36	2093.4			95.7%	1000.0	986.5			98.7%
La	N/A		<DL								
Li	N/A		<DL								
Mg	1.3 120.4% *		5.5								
Mn	0.8 90.5%	16.50	16.3			93.4%	10.0	10.4			103.9%
Mo	27.1 3.7%		27.2								
Nd	82365.7 0.6%	1650.36	83626.6			76.4% #	1000.0	980.2			98.0%
Ni	634.2 0.1%	82.52	766.0			159.7% #	50.0	49.2			98.5%
Pb	N/A	825.18	750.3			90.9%	500.0	483.7			96.7%
Re	N/A		<DL								
Rh	N/A		<DL								
Ru	N/A		<DL								
Sb	N/A		<DL								
Se	N/A	825.18	521.1			63.2%	500.0	341.3			68.3%
Si	29.6 58.2%	825.18	1117.6			131.8%	500.0	664.1			132.8%
Sr	N/A		(0.1)								
Te	N/A		<DL								
Th	N/A		<DL								
Ti	N/A		<DL								
Tl	204.7 23.4%		(111.8)								
U	1127.3 0.4%	1650.36	2611.3			89.9%	1000.0	942.8			94.3%
V	N/A	82.52	81.7			99.1%	50.0	52.0			104.1%
Zn	2.4 19.0%		3.1								
Zr	N/A	82.52	76.0			92.1%	50.0	48.0			96.0%
P	3652.1 0.1%		3612.3								
Bi	N/A	825.18					500.0				

Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
3) The process "Blank" has been subtracted from the "Spike + Sample" and "Spike Control" results.
4) Spike Flag (#): Spike is less than 25% of sample concentration; %recovery for information only.
5) RPD flag (*): RPD > 20% and both sample and duplicate results > QL.

08/13/92

Table 6c: SST Core 34, ICP Core Composite Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 06/12/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6740A1	92-6740A1	92-6740A2	92-6740A2	92-6740A3	92-6740A3			92-6740A1	92-6740A2		
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00			Average			
ug/g Factor	215.5	1077.6	177.2	885.9	194.5	972.4	***Estimated***				20%	
ICP Run #	817	822	816	821	815	820	DL	DL			RPD	Flg
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	24173.3	24987.8	3.4%	22378.4	23267.0	4.0%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	23275.8	7.7%
As	(57.2)	<DL		66.7	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	62.0	15.4%
B	100.7	(101.0)		93.3	(91.4)		65.3	(62.2)	0.0596	0.1987	97.0	7.7%
Ba	58.1	59.8	3.0%	50.5	51.2	1.3%	<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	54.3	13.8%
Be	(1.3)	<DL		(1.2)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	1.2	2.2%
Ca	22462.4	26679.5	18.8%	20837.9	25338.4	21.6%	272.7	298.5	0.0016	0.0054	21650.1	7.5%
Cd	12.0	(8.6)		10.1	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	11.0	17.4%
Ce	129.8	<DL		139.6	(96.3)		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	134.7	7.3%
Co	<DL	<DL		(65.8)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	245.9	254.0	3.3%	228.3	235.4	3.1%	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	237.1	7.4%
Cu	15.9	(15.0)		13.6	(11.7)		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	14.7	15.8%
Dy	(1.9)	<DL		(3.1)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	2.5	46.1%
Fe	26227.4	27879.2	6.3%	13920.0	14727.7	5.8%	12.9	(11.8)	0.0100	0.0334	20073.7	61.3% *
K	589.1	(548.5)		621.2	(531.5)		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	605.1	5.3%
La	104.1	104.4	0.3%	98.5	98.1	0.4%	<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	101.3	5.6%
Li	(4.3)	<DL		5.3	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	4.8	19.4%
Mg	453.9	482.9	6.4%	412.8	437.9	6.1%	56.3	57.8	0.0003	0.0009	433.4	9.5%
Mn	241.2	254.6	5.6%	177.1	185.7	4.9%	(0.3)	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	209.2	30.7% *
Mo	35.9	(34.2)		34.2	(30.9)		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	35.1	5.0%
Na	97347.0	100831.9	3.6%	92815.4	96775.3	4.3%	134.1	(72.4)	0.0587	0.1957	95081.2	4.8%
Nd	211.0	200.1	5.2%	201.5	193.7	3.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	206.2	4.6%
Ni	18241.8	19618.5	7.5%	17202.0	18385.0	6.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	17721.9	5.9%
Pb	3127.5	3346.7	7.0%	2792.7	2934.7	5.1%	<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	2960.1	11.3%
Re	(11.7)	<DL		13.0	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	12.4	10.6%
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	(34.1)	<DL		39.5	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	36.8	14.7%
Se	(91.8)	<DL		117.3	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	104.5	24.4%
Si	1570.4	1523.2	3.0%	1336.9	1294.1	3.2%	69.6	<DL	0.0549	0.1830	1453.6	16.1%
Sr	219.1	228.0	4.0%	205.7	215.7	4.9%	1.1	(0.8)	0.0004	0.0013	212.4	6.3%
Te	<DL	<DL		(21.8)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	99.7	(85.3)		106.1	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	102.9	6.2%
Ti	46.7	45.3	2.9%	43.8	40.3	8.1%	(1.6)	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	45.2	6.3%
Tl	<DL	<DL		(106.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	12412.3	12533.4	1.0%	11808.8	12062.4	2.1%	<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	12110.6	5.0%
V	22.5	(19.7)		18.9	(16.6)		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	20.7	17.4%
Zn	255.9	280.4	9.5%	169.2	182.8	8.0%	2.8	(6.8)	0.0041	0.0136	212.6	40.8% *
Zr	21.0	(19.3)		14.4	(12.0)		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	17.7	37.3% *
P	19318.7	20481.8	6.0%	18877.9	19642.1	4.0%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	19098.3	2.3%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50% DL potentially bias high.
7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/12/92

07/27/92

Table 6d: SST Core 34, ICP Quarter Segment 2C Top Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALD-211

Analyzed Date: 05/20/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6729A	92-6729A	92-6729B	92-6729B	92-6745	92-6745					
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00					
ug/g Factor	280.3	1401.3	134.1	670.5	181.4	907.0	***Estimated***		92-6729A		
ICP Run #	684	715	685	716	683	714	DL	QL	92-6729B		
									Average		20X
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	%Diff	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	%Diff	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A
Al	11920.0	11619.4	2.5%	12234.1	11892.7	2.8%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	12077.1 2.6%
As	(30.4)	<DL		(32.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	31.5 6.9%
B	100.3	(110.6)		62.5	(66.2)		62.9	(76.0)	0.0596	0.1987	81.4 46.4% *
Be	37.0	(35.1)		33.7	32.6	3.5%	<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	35.4 9.1%
Be	<DL	<DL		(0.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	N/A
Ca	OvrRng	28197.1		OvrRng	26114.2		178.0	235.6	0.0016	0.0054	N/A
Cd	7.5	<DL		6.4	(6.8)		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	7.0 16.6%
Ce	(60.6)	<DL		54.4	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	57.5 10.7%
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A
Cr	232.7	226.2	2.8%	217.2	214.1	1.4%	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	225.0 6.9%
Cu	16.4	(15.9)		8.2	(6.5)		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	12.3 66.6% *
Dy	<DL	<DL		(1.4)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	N/A
Fe	12426.0	12262.2	1.3%	7063.5	7015.6	0.7%	16.7	(15.0)	0.0100	0.0334	9744.7 55.0% *
K	500.8	(517.2)		503.6	(454.8)		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	502.2 0.6%
La	45.4	(42.1)		43.8	42.4	3.2%	<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	44.6 3.5%
Li	(4.9)	<DL		3.9	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	4.4 22.2%
Mg	421.2	418.1	0.8%	368.1	366.9	0.3%	36.8	38.5	0.0003	0.0009	394.7 13.5%
Mn	121.6	120.5	0.9%	85.1	84.8	0.4%	(0.2)	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	103.4 35.3% *
Mo	29.3	(25.5)		28.7	(28.0)		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	29.0 1.9%
Na	85165.4	83531.4	1.9%	83679.5	81327.5	2.8%	104.6	(79.9)	0.0587	0.1957	84422.4 1.8%
Nd	101.6	(104.7)		106.3	(103.6)		<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	103.9 4.5%
Ni	18605.1	18692.5	0.5%	16777.7	16978.2	1.2%	<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	17691.4 10.3%
Pb	1320.9	1315.5	0.4%	1140.4	1134.7	0.5%	<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	1230.7 14.7%
Re	(12.0)	<DL		12.0	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	12.0 0.0%
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A
Sb	(25.2)	<DL		(20.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	22.9 20.8%
Se	(59.1)	<DL		(51.9)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	55.5 13.0%
Si	703.2	619.7	11.9%	695.9	639.5	8.1%	108.1	(101.8)	0.0549	0.1830	699.5 1.0%
Sr	149.6	145.5	2.7%	142.3	138.9	2.4%	0.7	(0.8)	0.0004	0.0013	146.0 5.0%
Te	<DL	<DL		(14.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A
Th	(44.2)	<DL		43.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	43.7 2.3%
Ti	25.6	(16.5)		22.8	20.2	11.8%	(1.8)	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	24.2 11.2%
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	N/A
U	5978.1	6288.4	5.2%	5796.4	6107.0	5.4%	<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	5887.3 3.1%
V	10.8	<DL		9.2	(8.7)		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	10.0 15.5%
Zn	189.3	190.6	0.7%	119.2	121.2	1.6%	(2.0)	<DL	0.0041	0.0136	154.2 45.4% *
Zr	18.4	(16.2)		5.5	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	12.0 107.5% *
P	17980.3	18475.3	2.8%	17803.4	17445.8	2.0%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	17891.8 1.0%
Bi											N/A

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 05/20/92

07/27/92

933045.005

Table 6e: SST Core 34, ICP Quarter Segment 2C Bottom Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 05/20/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6730A	92-6730A		92-6730B	92-6730B		92-6745	92-6745				
Dilution:	1.00	5.00		1.00	5.00		1.00	5.00				
ug/g Factor	208.6	1042.8		169.3	846.6		186.9	934.5		92-6730A		
ICP Run #	686	717		687	718		688	714		92-6730B		
										Average		20%
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	Diff	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	Diff	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	11418.4	11091.7	2.9%	10535.5	10118.0	4.0%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	10977.0	8.0%
As	(32.7)	<DL		(28.4)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	30.5	14.2%
B	65.4	(69.3)		70.1	(69.1)		58.4	(78.3)	0.0596	0.1987	67.8	6.9%
Ba	33.3	31.9	4.2%	32.4	30.4	6.2%	<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	32.8	2.9%
Be	<DL	<DL		(0.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	N/A	
Ca	OvrRng	26701.8		OvrRng	25982.2		235.7	242.8	0.0016	0.0054	N/A	
Cd	6.7	(9.0)		6.1	(7.0)		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	6.4	9.4%
Ce	(47.9)	<DL		(55.9)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	51.9	15.3%
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	210.0	206.6	1.6%	218.4	209.9	3.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	214.2	3.9%
Cu	6.3	<DL		6.5	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	6.4	2.4%
Dy	<DL	<DL		(1.0)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	N/A	
Fe	9983.6	9826.0	1.6%	6236.1	6092.0	2.3%	18.0	(15.4)	0.0100	0.0334	8109.8	46.2% *
K	470.8	(572.2)		495.2	(473.0)		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	483.0	5.0%
La	40.1	(38.2)		40.1	36.9	7.8%	<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	40.1	0.1%
Li	(4.3)	<DL		4.4	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0266	4.3	1.3%
Mg	377.6	375.2	0.6%	366.5	360.1	1.7%	41.6	39.6	0.0003	0.0009	372.0	3.0%
Mn	99.5	98.2	1.3%	76.1	74.3	2.4%	(0.5)	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	87.8	26.6% *
Mo	26.5	(20.1)		27.8	(23.1)		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	27.2	4.9%
Na	80118.9	77947.9	2.7%	83401.6	80491.9	3.5%	111.5	(82.3)	0.0587	0.1957	81760.2	4.0%
Nd	101.2	(90.8)		101.4	(87.2)		<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	101.3	0.2%
Ni	17283.4	17331.6	0.3%	16830.2	16732.1	0.6%	<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	17056.8	2.7%
Pb	1166.1	1151.7	1.2%	1065.6	1046.7	1.8%	<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	1115.9	9.0%
Re	(11.8)	<DL		12.4	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	12.1	5.2%
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	(20.2)	<DL		(15.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	17.9	26.5%
Se	(50.7)	<DL		(48.8)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	49.7	3.9%
Si	579.9	502.8	13.3%	679.2	608.7	10.4%	118.3	(104.9)	0.0549	0.1830	629.5	15.8%
Sr	141.6	137.4	3.0%	138.8	133.6	3.7%	0.9	(0.8)	0.0004	0.0013	140.2	2.0%
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	(28.1)	<DL		(40.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	34.3	36.1%
Ti	22.0	(15.8)		20.2	(10.4)		(1.9)	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	21.1	8.4%
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	6248.4	5954.7	4.7%	5659.8	5889.4	4.1%	<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	5954.1	9.9%
V	8.3	<DL		9.0	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	8.7	7.4%
Zn	134.7	134.6	0.0%	114.4	114.1	0.2%	(2.0)	<DL	0.0041	0.0136	124.5	16.3%
Zr	8.2	<DL		7.7	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	8.0	6.0%
P	17574.0	17789.1	1.2%	17487.7	17174.3	1.8%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	17530.9	0.5%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 05/20/92

07/27/92

Table 6f: SST Core 34, ICP Quarter Segment 2D Top Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 05/21/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6731A	92-6731A	92-6731B	92-6731B	92-6746	92-6746	***Estimated***		92-6731A	20% RPO Flg
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	DL	QL	Average	
ug/g Factor	170.4	851.9	187.1	935.4	178.3	891.7				
ICP Run #	695	722	696	723	694	721				
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al J	34578.4	34659.0	0.2%	22443.7	22397.6	0.2%	0.1829	0.6096	28511.0	42.6% *
As	(24.4)	<DL		(32.7)	<DL		0.1014	0.3379	28.5	29.0%
B J	94.8	(89.1)		74.8	(76.6)		0.0596	0.1987	84.8	23.5% *
Be	48.8	48.2	1.1%	49.0	48.4	1.4%	0.0080	0.0267	48.9	0.5%
Be	2.0	<DL		(2.0)	<DL		0.0032	0.0107	2.0	1.2%
Ca	OvrRng	19478.7		OvrRng	21847.9		0.0016	0.0054	N/A	
Cd	11.3	(12.9)		11.2	(11.9)		0.0075	0.0250	11.3	0.6%
Ce	110.2	(94.1)		93.5	<DL		0.1019	0.3396	101.9	16.3%
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	184.6	184.4	0.1%	202.3	202.0	0.1%	0.0113	0.0378	193.4	9.1%
Cu	12.6	(11.5)		12.3	(10.8)		0.0088	0.0294	12.5	1.8%
Dy	(1.6)	<DL		(1.1)	<DL		0.0053	0.0176	1.4	40.7%
Fe	15054.5	15366.8	2.1%	14867.1	15105.1	1.6%	0.0100	0.0334	14960.8	1.3%
K	487.3	(475.9)		484.2	(541.2)		0.3173	1.0576	470.8	5.7%
La	92.8	89.9	3.1%	76.8	75.0	2.3%	0.0124	0.0414	84.8	18.9%
Li	(3.7)	<DL		(3.7)	<DL		0.0074	0.0246	3.7	0.2%
Mg	354.4	361.9	2.1%	379.3	386.3	1.8%	0.0003	0.0009	366.8	6.8%
Mn	202.2	206.2	2.0%	169.3	172.1	1.7%	0.0010	0.0034	185.7	17.7%
Mo	32.9	(32.1)		31.2	(30.6)		0.0128	0.0427	32.1	5.3%
Na	74795.1	74951.9	0.2%	82802.4	82510.5	0.4%	0.0587	0.1957	78798.7	10.2%
Nd	188.1	179.5	4.6%	157.4	(154.2)		0.0496	0.1653	172.7	17.7%
Ni	14072.4	14592.4	3.7%	15580.4	16123.8	3.5%	0.0231	0.0768	14826.4	10.2%
Pb	2594.4	2660.8	2.6%	2679.7	2549.9	2.8%	0.0831	0.2771	2537.0	4.5%
Re	(9.8)	<DL		(10.1)	<DL		0.0173	0.0576	10.0	3.4%
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	43.8	(45.4)		45.2	(51.7)		0.0475	0.1584	44.5	3.3%
Se J	134.4	(138.5)		98.7	<DL		0.1515	0.5050	116.6	30.6% *
Si	1055.5	996.9	5.6%	1053.4	993.3	5.7%	0.0549	0.1830	1054.4	0.2%
Sr	209.8	209.7	0.0%	175.6	174.2	0.8%	0.0004	0.0013	192.7	17.8%
Te	(27.3)	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	74.6	<DL		82.4	<DL		0.0734	0.2448	78.5	9.9%
Ti	41.4	41.8	1.1%	40.9	40.0	2.0%	0.0054	0.0179	41.1	1.3%
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	18947.1	20256.4	6.9%	20338.6	21673.4	6.6%	0.5376	1.7920	19642.9	7.1%
V	16.6	(16.8)		16.6	(16.0)		0.0090	0.0301	16.6	0.2%
Zn	188.9	180.6	4.4%	177.5	185.7	4.6%	0.0041	0.0136	183.2	6.2%
Zr J	9.0	(7.3)		12.9	(12.3)		0.0076	0.0253	11.0	35.3% *
P	16581.3	16382.3	1.2%	18482.6	18109.8	2.0%	0.6133	2.0442	17532.0	10.8%
Bi									N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) *** flag: RPO > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 05/21/92

07/27/92

Table 6g: SST Core 34, ICP Quarter Segment 2D Bottom Acid Digestion CORE 34

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 05/21/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6732A	92-6732A	92-6732B	92-6732B	92-6746	92-6746						
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00						
ug/g Factor	195.2	976.0	185.5	927.4	190.2	951.1	***Estimated***		92-6732A			
ICP Run #	697	724	698	725	699	721	DL	QL	92-6732B	Average		
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2dif	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	20%	RPD	Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	27790.5	27951.5	0.6%	23400.1	23312.7	0.4%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	25595.3	17.2%
As	(33.0)	<DL		(46.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	39.8	34.3%
B	78.7	(75.6)		64.3	(60.6)		<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987	71.5	20.1% *
Ba	50.0	49.0	2.0%	52.6	51.3	2.5%	<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	51.3	5.1%
Be	(2.0)	<DL		2.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	2.1	6.6%
Ca	OvrRng	21935.7		OvrRng	23332.4		188.5	134.9	0.0016	0.0054	N/A	
Cd	14.6	(16.3)		11.9	(11.6)		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	13.2	20.9% *
Ce	103.6	<DL		103.0	<DL		<DL	(106.9)	0.1019	0.3396	103.3	0.6%
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	214.7	212.9	0.8%	214.8	209.8	2.3%	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	214.8	0.0%
Cu	12.8	(9.1)		12.1	(9.7)		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	12.4	5.9%
Dy	(1.6)	<DL		(1.4)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	1.5	14.2%
Fe	30158.6	30839.3	2.3%	15229.7	15387.7	1.0%	12.4	(10.9)	0.0100	0.0334	22694.1	65.8% *
K	474.1	(477.1)		501.8	(545.9)		<DL	(322.6)	0.3173	1.0576	487.9	5.7%
La	76.5	71.9	5.9%	79.7	76.0	4.6%	<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	78.1	4.1%
Li	(3.4)	<DL		(4.1)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	3.8	17.6%
Mg	385.4	393.7	2.2%	413.4	420.4	1.7%	39.1	25.2	0.0003	0.0009	399.4	7.0%
Mn	237.9	243.8	2.5%	174.3	176.5	1.3%	<DL	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	206.1	30.9% *
Mo	32.5	(34.2)		32.8	(30.2)		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	32.6	0.9%
Na	79291.4	79525.7	0.3%	84930.0	84571.1	0.4%	115.6	(92.3)	0.0587	0.1957	82110.7	6.9%
Nd	161.3	(149.9)		169.6	155.1	8.6%	<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	165.4	5.0%
Ni	15501.1	16033.6	3.4%	16406.2	16875.6	2.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	15953.6	5.7%
Pb	3129.6	3207.5	2.5%	2661.4	2699.0	1.4%	<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	2895.5	16.2%
Re	(10.5)	<DL		11.1	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	10.8	5.4%
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	53.7	<DL		48.1	(55.4)		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	50.9	11.0%
Se	108.5	<DL		111.5	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	110.0	2.8%
Si	1101.3	1044.8	5.1%	1114.9	1040.0	6.7%	76.7	<DL	0.0549	0.1830	1108.1	1.2%
Sr	177.1	176.8	0.2%	187.8	186.2	0.9%	0.7	(0.9)	0.0004	0.0013	182.4	5.9%
Te	(21.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	81.4	<DL		88.7	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	85.0	8.6%
Ti	41.2	40.8	1.0%	48.3	48.2	0.1%	(1.6)	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	44.7	15.9%
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	(713.8)	0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	20285.0	21659.2	6.8%	22038.4	23359.9	6.0%	<DL	(694.4)	0.5376	1.7920	21161.7	8.3%
V	20.8	(19.5)		17.7	(16.1)		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	19.2	16.5%
Zn	215.1	224.8	4.5%	191.2	199.3	4.2%	(1.5)	<DL	0.0041	0.0136	203.2	11.8%
Zr	11.2	(9.2)		10.9	(9.4)		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	11.1	2.9%
P	18355.2	18370.7	0.1%	19544.0	19139.2	2.1%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	18949.6	6.3%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 05/21/92

07/27/92

Table 8a: SST Core 34, ICP Drainable Liquid Water Leach

WHC-SU-WM-UP-020
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Water Leach

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 06/10/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#: 92-6747C192-6747C1		92-6747C292-6747C2		92-6747C592-6747C5									
Dilution: 2.00 10.00		2.00 10.00		2.00 10.00									
ug/g Factor	169.1	845.7		172.2	860.9		170.7	853.3				92-6747C1	
ICP Run #	802	806		801	805		800	804		DL	QL	92-6747C2	
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)		(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1829	0.6096	N/A	
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1014	0.3379	N/A	
B	(22.6)	<DL		(23.1)	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0596	0.1987	22.9	2.2%
Ba	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0080	0.0267	N/A	
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0032	0.0107	N/A	
Ca	<DL	5.4		<DL	6.1		11.6	31.8		0.0016	0.0054	N/A	
Cd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0075	0.0250	N/A	
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1019	0.3396	N/A	
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	171.3	176.0	2.7%	169.4	173.8	2.6%	<DL	<DL		0.0113	0.0378	170.3	1.1%
Cu	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0088	0.0294	N/A	
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0053	0.0176	N/A	
Fe	1210.3	1243.1	2.7%	1196.4	1300.2	8.7%	<DL	<DL		0.0100	0.0334	1203.4	1.2%
K	492.3	(478.2)		501.1	(510.7)		<DL	<DL		0.3173	1.0576	496.7	1.8%
La	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0124	0.0414	N/A	
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0074	0.0246	N/A	
Mg	1.0	1.7	73.6%	0.9	1.8	93.4%	1.1	2.4		0.0003	0.0009	1.0	9.5%
Mn	(0.4)	<DL		(0.4)	(1.5)		<DL	<DL		0.0010	0.0034	0.4	1.8%
Mo	27.9	(32.7)		27.9	(31.5)		<DL	<DL		0.0128	0.0427	27.9	0.1%
Na	86016.1	87836.1	2.1%	85326.4	86905.2	1.9%	<DL	<DL		0.0587	0.1957	85671.3	0.8%
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0496	0.1653	N/A	
Ni	792.8	819.1	3.3%	784.4	812.1	3.5%	<DL	<DL		0.0231	0.0768	788.6	1.1%
Pb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0831	0.2771	N/A	
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0173	0.0576	N/A	
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	(9.1)	<DL		(10.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0475	0.1584	9.8	14.5%
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1515	0.5050	N/A	
Si	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0549	0.1830	N/A	
Sr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	(0.3)		0.0004	0.0013	N/A	
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0734	0.2448	N/A	
Ti	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0054	0.0179	N/A	
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	1148.3	(1104.6)		1123.3	(1155.4)		<DL	<DL		0.5376	1.7920	1135.8	2.2%
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0090	0.0301	N/A	
Zn	3.9	(4.8)		3.8	(5.3)		(0.8)	<DL		0.0041	0.0136	3.9	3.5%
Zr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0076	0.0253	N/A	
P	3795.6	3886.8	2.4%	3720.1	3744.9	0.7%	<DL	<DL		0.6133	2.0442	3757.8	2.0%
Bf												N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) 20% "==" flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/10/92

07/27/92

9313045.0309

Table 8b: SST Core 34, ICP Core Composite Water Leach

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Water Leach

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 06/12/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#: 92-6740C1		92-6740C3		92-6740C1		***Estimated***		Average		20%	
Dilution: 2.00		2.00				DL		DL		RPD	
ug/g Factor	331.8					322.5					
ICP Run #	813					812					
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)
Ag	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0078	0.0261	
Al	315.4			<DL			<DL		0.1829	0.6096	
As	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.1014	0.3379	
B	(38.9)			<DL			<DL		0.0596	0.1987	
Ba	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0080	0.0267	
Be	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0032	0.0107	
Ca	240.0					45.9			0.0016	0.0054	
Cd	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0075	0.0250	
Ce	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.1019	0.3396	
Co	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.1865	0.6217	
Cr	206.7			<DL			<DL		0.0113	0.0378	
Cu	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0088	0.0294	
Dy	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0053	0.0176	
Fe	1630.0			<DL			<DL		0.0100	0.0334	
K	581.6			<DL			<DL		0.3173	1.0576	
La	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0124	0.0414	
Li	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0074	0.0246	
Mg	44.6					11.5			0.0003	0.0009	
Mn	(0.6)			<DL			<DL		0.0010	0.0034	
Mo	33.2			<DL			<DL		0.0128	0.0427	
Na	104939.0			(54.2)			<DL		0.0587	0.1957	
Nd	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0496	0.1653	
Ni	999.4			<DL			<DL		0.0231	0.0768	
Pb	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0831	0.2771	
Re	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0173	0.0576	
Rh	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0821	0.2738	
Ru	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0350	0.1167	
Sb	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0475	0.1584	
Se	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.1515	0.5050	
Si	76.4			<DL			<DL		0.0549	0.1830	
Sr	1.3			(0.2)			<DL		0.0004	0.0013	
Te	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0950	0.3168	
Th	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0734	0.2448	
Ti	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0054	0.0179	
Tl	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.5492	1.8308	
U	715.3			<DL			<DL		0.5376	1.7920	
V	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0090	0.0301	
Zn	5.6			(1.8)			<DL		0.0041	0.0136	
Zr	<DL			<DL			<DL		0.0076	0.0253	
P	6380.1			<DL			<DL		0.6133	2.0442	
Bi											

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > DL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/12/92

07/27/92

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

fluoride

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	1000	1000	0%						
92-06734-B	900	900	0%						
92-06735-B	900	900	0%						
92-06736-B	900	1000	11%	1100	210	95%	280	112%	< 30
92-06740-C	1000								< 20
92-06747-C	600	600	0%	700	200	50%	280	112%	< 40
TRUE= 250 ug/mL									

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 9a: SST Core 34, IC Fluoride

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

chloride	SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g						TANK 112, CORE 34		
	SMPL	DUP		<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
SAMPLE ID	1	2	RPD	3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	1100	1100	0%						
92-06734-B	1000	1000	0%						
92-06735-B	900	900	0%						
92-06736-B	800	900	12%	1000	210	95%	260	104%	30
92-06740-C	1300								< 20
92-06747-C	1000	1000	0%	1200	200	100%	250	100%	< 40
							TRUE= 250 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.

Table 9b: SST Core 34, IC Chloride

 WMC-SD-WM-DP-026
 ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
 CORE 34

WMC-52-0640 Rev. 1

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

nitrite		SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g					TANK 112, CORE 34		
SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	61000	59000	3%						
92-06734-B	53000	54000	2%						
92-06735-B	48000	49000	2%						
92-06736-B J	44000	47000	7%	60000	12400	129%	13800	92%	< 50
92-06740-C	62000								< 50
92-06747-C	55000	55000	0%	67000	12200	98%	13500	90%	< 80

TRUE = 15000 ug/mL

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

WMC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34
Table 9c: SST Core 34, IC Nitrite

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

nitrate

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	80000	78000	3%						
92-06734-B	69000	70000	1%						
92-06735-B	64000	65000	2%						
92-06736-B J	58000	61000	5%	80000	16500	133%	19600	98%	< 50
92-06740-C	80000								< 50
92-06747-C	72000	72000	0%	89000	16300	104%	18600	93%	< 80

TRUE= 20000 ug/mL

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 9d: SST Core 34, IC Nitrate

WMC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

phosphate	SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g			TANK 112, CORE 34					
SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	10800	12500	15%						
92-06734-B	12000	12200	2%						
92-06735-B	11200	11900	6%						
92-06736-B	16500	18500	11%	19000	2890	87%	3420	98%	< 50
92-06740-C	19100								< 50
92-06747-C	11700	11600	1%	14800	2850	109%	3260	93%	< 80

TRUE = 3500 ug/mL

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.) / sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample) / spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

sulfate

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	14200	14600	3%						
92-06734-B	13100	13000	1%						
92-06735-B	11600	11900	3%						
92-06736-B J	10700	11600	8%	15000	3100	139%	3700	99%	< 50
92-06740-C J	15600								< 50
92-06747-C	11700	11600	1%	14800	3060	101%	3260	87%	90
							TRUE= 3750 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 9f: SST Core 34, IC Sulfate
 WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
 ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
 CORE 34

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

free CN

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06733-B	1870	1840	2%						
92-06734-B	1620	1540	5%						
92-06735-B	1440	1440	0%						
92-06736-B	1150	1330	15%						> 1
92-06740-C	2050								> 5
92-06747-C	1640	1550	6%						> 8

THERE ARE NO SPIKES OR SPIKE CONTROLS FOR THIS SET OF DATA.

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample 92-06740-C3, a process blank, has been reported under the blank ("5") entries.
4. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
5. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.) / sample wt.
6. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample) / spike.
7. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
8. See narrative for discussion of results for process blanks associated with 92-06740 and 92-06747.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 99: SST Core 34, IC Free Cyanide
 CORE 34
 ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
 MIC-SD-MM-DP-026

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 34Table 10: Other Inorganic ResultsGFAA: Drainable Liquid

Arsenic	92-06747-B1	sample	<0.5 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
	-B2	duplicate	<0.5 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
	-B3	spike	3.18 $\mu\text{g/g}$	(78% Recovery)
	-B4	control	2.55 $\mu\text{g/ml}$	(102% Recovery)
	-B5	proc. blk.	<0.5 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
Selenium	92-06747-B1	sample	<0.4 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
	-B2	duplicate	<0.3 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
	-B3	spike	3.10 $\mu\text{g/g}$	(76% Recovery)
	-B4	control	2.24 $\mu\text{g/ml}$	(89% Recovery)
	-B5	proc. blk.	<0.3 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
Antimony	92-06747-A1	sample	<1.0 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
	-A2	duplicate	<1.0 $\mu\text{g/g}$	
	-A3	spike	3.46 $\mu\text{g/g}$	(84% Recovery)
	-A4	control	2.17 $\mu\text{g/ml}$	(87% Recovery)
	-A5	proc. blk.	<1.0 $\mu\text{g/g}$	

Chromium(VI): Drainable Liquid

92-06747-C1	sample	125 $\mu\text{g/g}$
-C2	duplicate	136 $\mu\text{g/g}$
-C5	proc. blk.	<90 $\mu\text{g/g}$

Mercury: Drainable Liquid

92-06747-D1	sample	3.60 $\mu\text{g/g}$
-D2	duplicate	3.45 $\mu\text{g/g}$
(92-06767-D3)	spike	N/A (spike <<25% sample)
(92-06767-D4)	control	1.57 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (79% Recovery)
(92-06767-D5)	proc. blk.	<0.3 $\mu\text{g/g}$

Ammonia: Drainable Liquid

92-06747-C1	sample	23 $\mu\text{g/g}$
-C2	duplicate	23 $\mu\text{g/g}$
-C5	proc. blk.	17 $\mu\text{g/g}$

Ammonia: Water Leach -- Core Composite

92-06740-C1	sample	17 $\mu\text{g/g}$
-C3	proc. blk.	11 $\mu\text{g/g}$
92-06740-C2	duplicate	<5 $\mu\text{g/g}$
(92-06761-B5)	proc. blk.	<5 $\mu\text{g/g}$

9213045.0318

Table 11: TOC/TIC/TC Results

			<u>TOC (μg/g)</u>	<u>TIC (μg/g)</u>	<u>TC (μg/g)</u>
<u>Direct -- Quarter Segments</u>					
92-06733-C1	sample	J	3900	6300	10200
-C2	duplicate		5900	9000	14900
-C3	proc. blk.		1500	310	1800
92-06734-C1	sample	J	2800	5400	8200
-C2	duplicate		3200	5300	8500
-C3	proc. blk.		1000	210	1200
92-06735-C1	sample	J	3000	5300	8300
-C2	duplicate		3200	5000	8200
-C3	proc. blk.		2100	320	2400
92-06736-C1	sample	J	4100	6700	10800
-C2	duplicate		3800	6500	10300
-C3	proc. blk.		2500	390	2900

			<u>TOC (μg/g)</u>	<u>TIC (μg/g)</u>	<u>TC (μg/g)</u>
<u>Drainable Liquid</u>					
92-06747-C1	sample		1900	6100	8000
-C2	duplicate		2100	5000	5100
-C3	proc. blk.		140	<40	140

Water Leach -- Core Composite

92-06740-C1	sample		3050	8850	11900
-C3	proc. blk.		620	<80	620
92-06740-C2	duplicate		3200	8300	11500
(92-06761-B5)	proc. blk.		230	470	700

9213045.0019

TABLE 12a: SST Core 34 Gamma Energy Analysis of Core Composites

Sample ID	*	Co(60) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(137) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(154) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(155) uCi/g	+/- % error	Am(241) uCi/g	+/- % error	Sb(125) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(134) uCi/g	+/- % error	K(40) uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite																	
92-06747B1	A/smp	1.23E-03	14.1	4.19E-02	4.1									8.53E-04	22.2		
92-06747B2	A/dup	7.31E-04	21.7	4.54E-02	4.8												
92-06747B5	A/blk	6.97E-04	22.1	4.46E-02	4.8									9.49E-04	16.9		
92-06747B6	A/smp	4.12E-03	6.1	1.29E-02	5.3											2.90E-03	51.0
92-06747B7	A/dup	4.32E-03	6.1	1.40E-02	5.2							2.08E-03	24.0				
92-06747B8	A/blk			<5.54E-04												4.16E-03	39.0
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite																	
92-06740B1	F/smp	2.98E-02	21.9	7.50E-02	3.5	1.25E+00	2.9	1.27E+00	6.6	7.58E-01	12.4						
92-06740B3	F/blk	7.77E-04	30.6	2.55E-02	5.0											2.11E-03	99.5
92-06740C1	W/smp	4.35E-03	7.3	8.66E+00	3.5	1.25E-02	7.0	1.15E-02	24.5	9.06E-03	30.4						
92-06740C2	W/dup	4.17E-03	5.5	3.65E+00	3.5	8.63E-03	6.5	9.28E-03	15.0								
92-06740C3	W/blk			1.92E-03	16.6											3.72E-03	36.5
92-06761B5	W/blk			1.58E-02	4.3									5.14E-04	17.0	1.98E-03	42.0

* A = acid digestion, F = fusion, W = water leach
 smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

TABLE 12b: SST Core 34 Gamma Energy Analysis of Quarter Segment

Sample ID	*	Co(60) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(137) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(154) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(155) uCi/g	+/- % error	Am(241) uCi/g	+/- % error	Sb(125) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(134) uCi/g	+/- % error	K(40) uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 1-D																	
92-06733A1	F/smp	3.46E-02	11.8	1.69E+02	3.5	5.87E-01	3.2	6.56E-01	8.6	3.85E-01	13.6						
92-06733A2	F/dup	4.70E-02	9.6	3.16E+02	3.5	3.73E-01	4.6	4.26E-01	10.3	2.82E-01	18.0						
92-06733A3	F/blk			3.27E-02	8.3												
92-06733B1	W/smp	3.70E-03	5.8	2.20E-01	3.5							3.61E-03	24.8			9.97E-04	84.0
92-06733B2	W/dup	4.15E-03	5.4	8.51E-01	3.5												
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 2-B																	
92-06734A1	F/smp	3.27E-02	18.9	6.13E+02	3.5	1.78E+00	2.1	1.85E+00	4.6	1.13E+00	7.8						
92-06734A2	F/dup	4.31E-02	18.5	6.11E+02	3.5	1.84E+00	2.3	1.94E+00	5.0	9.99E-01	10.1						
92-06734A3	F/blk			3.27E-02	8.3												
92-06734B1	W/smp	3.66E-03	5.8	8.18E-01	3.5	1.74E-03	18.0					6.62E-03	24.7				
92-06734B2	W/dup	3.58E-03	5.3	9.49E-01	3.5							5.32E-03	28.3				
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 2-C																	
92-06729A	A/smp	1.38E-02	9.5	8.09E+00	3.5	4.76E-01	1.7	5.58E-01	3.6	2.86E-01	6.1						
92-06729B	A/dup	9.91E-03	8.8	3.08E+00	3.5	4.78E-01	1.4	5.54E-01	3.2	2.99E-01	4.6						
92-06730A	A/smp	7.67E-03	11.3	4.34E+00	3.5	4.26E-01	1.7	5.08E-01	3.5	2.51E-01	5.9						
92-06730B	A/dup	5.88E-03	12.8	9.73E+00	3.5	4.00E-01	1.5	4.39E-01	3.4	2.41E-01	5.5						
92-06745	A/blk	8.79E-04	19.9	1.49E-02	5.2												
92-06735A1	F/smp			8.01E+02	3.5	4.67E-01	5.2	4.28E-01	13.9	3.30E-01	21.2						
92-06735A2	F/dup			7.88E+02	3.5	5.19E-01	4.2	4.66E-01	11.5	3.52E-01	17.8						
92-06735A3	F/blk			4.69E-02	7.1												
92-06735B1	W/smp	3.51E-03	5.5	1.08E+00	3.5												
92-06735B2	W/dup	3.19E-03	6.1	1.48E+00	3.5												
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 2-D																	
92-06731A	A/smp	7.45E-03	18.0	3.55E+00	3.5	1.07E+00	1.3	1.21E+00	3.1	1.84E+00	3.0						
92-06731B	A/dup	1.33E-02	20.5	2.21E+01	3.5	8.64E-01	1.8	9.80E-01	4.0	5.56E-01	6.7						
92-06732A	A/smp			5.76E+00	3.5	8.26E-01	1.9	9.07E-01	3.9	5.43E-01	6.9						
92-06732B	A/dup	1.22E-02	20.7	8.27E+00	3.5	8.96E-01	1.8	1.02E+00	3.9	5.38E-01	6.2						
92-06746	A/blk	2.03E-03	9.8	5.88E-02	3.9												
92-06736A1	F/smp			5.13E+02	3.5	9.26E-01	2.9	1.03E+00	6.2	6.86E-01	11.7						
92-06736A2	F/dup			5.02E+02	3.5	9.21E-01	2.9	9.72E-01	6.5	7.45E-01	10.8						
92-06736A3	F/blk			4.69E-02	7.1												
92-06736B1	W/smp	3.17E-03	6.6	6.79E+00	3.5	9.30E-03	7.4	1.21E-02	14.9	6.92E-03	29.8						
92-06736B2	W/dup	3.64E-03	6.6	1.31E+01	3.5	1.10E-02	6.5	1.24E-02	18.5	7.37E-03	34.4						
92-06736B5	W/blk			3.85E-04	43.5											1.45E-03	53.0

* F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

TABLE 13a: SST Core 34, Radiochemistry Data
Total Beta, Uranium, Tc-99, and Se-79

Sample ID	*	Total Beta as SrY-90 (uCi/g)	+/- % error	Uranium mg/g	+/- % error	Tc-99 uCi/g	+/- % error	Se-79 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite									
92-06747-B-1	A/smp	7.48E-01	2.7	1.18E+00	5.0	2.25E-01	6.4	8.29E-05	17.8
92-06747-B-2	A/dup	7.30E-01	2.7	1.20E+00	5.0	1.21E-01	7.7	7.21E-05	19.8
92-06747-B-5	A/blk	1.62E-01	3.2	<2E-03		1.04E-01	7.9	<3E-05	
92-06747-B-6	A/smp	6.25E-01	2.8	**		1.11E-01	10.9	**	
92-06747-B-7	A/dup	6.32E-01	2.8	**		1.13E-01	10.9	**	
92-06747-B-8	A/blk	<4E-04		**		<2E-03		**	
92-06747-C-1	W/smp	**		1.02E+00	5.0	**		**	
92-06747-C-2	W/dup	**		1.12E+00	5.0	**		**	
92-06747-C-5	W/blk	**		<7E-04		**		**	
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite									
92-06740-B-1	F/smp	7.07E+03	3.5	1.77E+01	7.0	1.39E-01	10.0	3.37E-04	37.5
92-06740-B-2	F/dup	***		***		***		***	
92-06740-B-3	F/blk	1.57E-01	4.5	3.69E-03	34.0	1.80E-03	50.1	<2E-04	
92-06740-C-1	W/smp	6.58E+01	3.3	**		**		**	
92-06740-C-2	W/dup	4.57E+01	2.8	**		**		**	
92-06740-C-3	W/blk	7.52E-03	4.5	**		**		**	
92-06761-B-5	W/blk	9.94E-03	3.4	**		**		**	

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** = not requested

*** = inadequate sample available

Table 13b: SST Core 34, Radiochemistry Data
Total Alpha, Am-241, Pu-238/239/240 and Np-237

Sample ID	*	Tot Alpha uCi/g	+/- % error	Am-241 uCi/g	+/- % error	Pu-239/240 uCi/g	+/- % error	Pu-238 uCi/g	+/- % error	Np-237 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite											
92-06747-B-1	A/smp	3.86E-03	7.5	**		**		**		**	
92-06747-B-2	A/dup	3.35E-03	7.9	**		**		**		**	
92-06747-B-5	A/blk	1.54E-03	12.4	**		**		**		**	
92-06747-B-6	A/smp	1.99E-03	10.6	**		**		**		**	
92-06747-B-7	A/dup	1.78E-03	11.2	**		**		**		**	
92-06747-B-8	A/blk	<2E-04		**		**		**		**	
92-06747-C-1	W/smp	**		<1E-04		7.93E-04	15.1	4.68E-05	15.1	<1E-05	
92-06747-C-2	W/dup	**		<1E-04		8.06E-04	32.8	6.22E-05	32.8	<1E-05	
92-06747-C-5	W/blk	**		<1E-04		<2E-05				1.30E-05	48.8
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite											
92-06740-B-1	F/smp	9.46E-01	12.0	6.13E-01	11.0	1.55E-01	7.5	1.37E-02	7.5	6.62E-04	12.6
92-06740-B-2	F/dup	***		***		***		***		***	
92-06740-B-3	FA/blk	4.43E-04	43.5	4.13E-04		1.56E-04	28.7	3.52E-04	28.7	<7E-05	
92-06740-C-1	W/smp	1.02E-02	9.2	**		**		**		**	
92-06740-C-2	W/dup	6.98E-03	8.9	**		**		**		**	
92-06740-C-3	W/blk	<2E-04		**		**		**		**	
92-06761-B-5	W/blk	2.49E-04	31.6	**		**		**		**	

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** = not requested

*** = inadequate sample available

TABLE 13c: SST Core 34, Radiochemistry Data
H-3, C-14 and Ni63/59

Sample ID	*	H-3 uCi/g	+/- % error	C-14 uCi/g	+/- % error	Ni-63 uCi/g	+/- % error	Ni-59 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite									
92-06747 direct/smp		**		**		1.95E-2	15	1.70E-4	25
92-06747-B-1 A/smp		**		**					
92-06747-B-2 A/dup		**		**					
92-06747-B-5 A/blk		**		**					
92-06747-C-1 W/smp		2.34E-01	2.9	4.40E+03	12	**		**	
92-06747-C-2 W/dup		2.30E-01	2.9	4.00E-03	12	**		**	
92-06747-C-5 W/blk		7.25E-03	3.1	4.50E-05	12	**		**	
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite									
92-06740-B-1 F/smp		**		**		2.52E+0	15	2.58E-2	25
92-06740-B-2 F/dup		**		**		***		***	
92-06740-B-3 F/blk		**		**		<2E-03		<3E-3	
92-06740-C-1 W/smp		7.07E-02	2.7	2.20E-05	12	**		**	
92-06740-C-2 W/dup				1.70E-05	12	**		**	
92-06740-C-3 W/blk		2.28E-02	2.9	1.30E-05	12	**		**	

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** = not requested

*** = inadequate sample available

TABLE 13d: SST Core 34, Radiochemistry Data
Sr-90

Sample ID	*	Sr-90 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 1-D			
92-06733-A-1	F/smp	1.64E+03	7.6
92-06733-A-2	F/dup	9.91E+02	7.8
92-06733-A-3	F/blk	3.58E-01	104.1
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 2-B			
92-06734-A-1	F/smp	4.95E+03	7.7
92-06734-A-2	F/dup	4.77E+03	7.7
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 2-C			
92-06735-A-1	F/smp	1.13E+03	8.3
92-06735-A-2	F/dup	1.15E+03	8.1
92-06735-A-3	F/blk	3.47E-01	66.7
Core 34 - Quarter Segment 2-D			
92-06736-A-1	F/smp	2.45E+03	7.5
92-06736-A-2	F/dup	2.57E+03	7.5
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite			
92-06747-B-1	A/smp	3.41E-01	8.5
92-06747-B-2	A/dup	3.67E-01	8.4
92-06747-B-5	A/blk	7.07E-02	17.3
92-06747-B-6	A/smp	3.32E-01	7.7
92-06747-B-7	A/dup	3.38E-01	7.7
92-06747-B-8	A/blk	<5E-03	
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite			
92-06740-B-1	F/smp	3.51E+03	6.4
92-06740-B-3	F/blk	9.00E-02	20.1

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

Table 13e: SST Core 34 , Radiochemistry Data
Uranium and Plutonium Mass Percent Isotopics

Sample ID	*	Pu-238	Pu-239	Pu-240	Pu-241	Pu-242
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite						
92-06747-C-1	smp	0.028	93.936	5.790	0.173	0.073
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite						
92-06740-B-1	F/smp	0.037	93.885	5.846	0.153	0.077

Sample ID	*	U-234	U-235	U-236	U-238
Core 34 - Drainable Liquid Composite					
92-06747-C-1	smp	0.0055	0.6656	0.0094	99.3194
92-06747-C-2	dup	0.0053	0.6688	0.0092	99.3168
Core 34 - Solid Core Composite					
92-06740-B-1	F/smp	0.0075	0.6715	0.0103	99.3107

* F = fusion, smp = sample, dup = duplicate

WHS-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

Table 2-1: SST Core 35, ICP Quarter Segments Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Ni Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 09/14/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-8169a1	92-8169a2					92-8169a3				
Dilution:	1.00	1.00					1.00				
ug/g Factor	5497.2	5523.6					5510.3			***Estimated***	
ICP Run #	1126	1125					1124			DL	QL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	
Ag	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0078	0.0261	
Al	45790.5	44288.8	3.3%				<DL		0.1829	0.6096	
As	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1014	0.3379	
B	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0596	0.1987	
Ba	(136.4)	(135.9)	0.4%				<DL		0.0080	0.0267	
Be	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0032	0.0107	
Ca	14675.8	15309.8	4.2%				388.7		0.0016	0.0054	
Cd	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0075	0.0250	
Ce	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1019	0.3396	
Co	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1865	0.6217	
Cr	257.8	264.2	2.4%				<DL		0.0113	0.0378	
Cu	240.7	248.1	3.0%				210.9		0.0088	0.0294	
Dy	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0053	0.0176	
Fe	29941.3	34763.5	14.9%				300.3		0.0100	0.0334	
K	N/A	N/A					N/A		0.3173	1.0576	
La	(144.5)	(146.3)	1.2%				<DL		0.0124	0.0414	
Li	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0074	0.0246	
Mg	959.9	983.8	2.5%				69.1		0.0003	0.0009	
Mn	388.1	437.5	12.0%				48.5		0.0010	0.0034	
Mo	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0128	0.0427	
Na	81973.9	81141.5	1.0%				(740.6)		0.0587	0.1957	
Nd	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0496	0.1653	
Ni	N/A	N/A					N/A		0.0231	0.0768	
Pb	4260.5	5000.7	16.0%				<DL		0.0831	0.2771	
Re	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0173	0.0576	
Rh	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0821	0.2738	
Ru	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0350	0.1167	
Sb	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0475	0.1584	
Se	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1515	0.5050	
Si	8626.1	8900.0	3.1%				<DL		0.0549	0.1830	
Sr	429.6	450.5	4.7%				(2.3)		0.0004	0.0013	
Te	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0950	0.3168	
Th	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0734	0.2448	
Ti	195.4	216.0	10.0%				<DL		0.0054	0.0179	
Tl	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.5492	1.8308	
U	86289.1	93171.9	7.7%				<DL		0.5376	1.7920	
V	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0090	0.0301	
Zn	496.4	494.4	0.4%				107.5		0.0041	0.0136	
Zr	(67.4)	(80.8)	18.0%				<DL		0.0076	0.0253	
P	21854.1	22525.9	3.0%				<DL		0.6133	2.0442	
Bi											

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) 20% "RPD" flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/14/92

09/16/92

920540166

Table 2-2a: SST Core 35, ICP Drainable Liquid Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** Sample Results *****

Analyzed Date: 09/15/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 1 of 2

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

92-06774a1			92-06774a2			92-06774a3			***Estimated***		
Dilution: 1.00			1.00			1.00			DL	QL	
ug/g Factor 169.00			168.44			168.79					
ICP Run # 1153			1154			1150					
	Sample ug/g	Sample ug/g	XDif	Dupl. ug/g	Dupl. ug/g	XDif	Blank ug/g	Blank ug/g	XDif	ug/mL	ug/mL
Ag	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0078	0.0261
Al	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.1014	0.3379
B	98.0			88.0			73.9			0.0596	0.1987
Ba	<DL			(1.4)			<DL			0.0080	0.0267
Be	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0032	0.0107
Ca	394.1			433.1			419.3			0.0016	0.0054
Cd	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.1865	0.6217
Cr	152.2			151.6			<DL			0.0113	0.0378
Cu	(2.2)			(4.0)			(1.9)			0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0053	0.0176
Fe	741.0			750.4			16.5			0.0100	0.0334
K	512.7			502.1			<DL			0.3173	1.0576
La	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0074	0.0246
Mg	53.3			58.8			58.1			0.0003	0.0009
Mn	1.0			1.2			0.7			0.0010	0.0034
Mo	21.4			20.5			<DL			0.0128	0.0427
Na	J 70212.9			69612.6			223.4			0.0587	0.1957
Nd	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0496	0.1653
Ni	437.2			446.8			<DL			0.0231	0.0768
Pb	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0350	0.1167
Sb	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.1515	0.5050
Si	109.1			116.3			43.2			0.0549	0.1830
Sr	1.4			1.5			1.4			0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0734	0.2448
Ti	(2.4)			(2.7)			(3.0)			0.0054	0.0179
Tl	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.5492	1.8308
U	931.9			924.3			<DL			0.5376	1.7920
V	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0090	0.0301
Zn	3.8			4.7			2.7			0.0041	0.0136
Zr	<DL			<DL			<DL			0.0076	0.0253
P	J 3977.2			3941.3			<DL			0.6133	2.0442
Bi											

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) The process "Blank" has not been subtracted from the "Sample & Duplicate" results.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) "Estimated" Sample Detection Limit (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/15/92

09/17/92

Table 2-2b: SST Core 35, ICP Drainable Liquid Acid Digestion
QC Results

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** QC Results *****

Analyzed: 09/15/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 2 of 2

Samp Log#:		92-06774a4		92-06774a5								
Dilution:		1.00		1.00								
ug/g Factor:		168.92		100.00								
ICP Run #:		1152		1151								
Ave a1&a2 ug/g	20% RPD Flg	Spike Added ug/g	Spike+ Sample ug/g	Spike+ Sample ug/g	% Dif	XRec	Spk Flag	Spike STD ug/mL	Spike Control ug/mL	Spike Control ug/mL	% Dif	XRec
Ag	N/A	84.37	74.2			87.9%		50.0	46.1			92.1%
Al	N/A	421.83	434.2			102.9%		250.0	251.8			100.7%
As	N/A		312.6									
B	93.0	10.8%	115.7									
Ba	N/A	84.37	84.8			100.5%		50.0	48.5			96.9%
Be	N/A	8.44	8.1			96.1%		5.0	4.8			95.5%
Ca	413.6	9.4%	843.67	1256.6		99.9%		500.0	494.6			98.9%
Cd	N/A	42.18	41.0			97.2%		25.0	24.6			98.5%
Ce	N/A		<DL									
Co	N/A		<DL									
Cr	151.9	0.4%	84.37	233.4		96.7%		50.0	54.5			109.0%
Cu	3.1	60.0%		(2.6)								
Dy	N/A		<DL									
Fe	745.7	1.3%	84.37	834.6		105.4% #		50.0	51.2			102.3%
K	507.4	2.1%	1687.33	2110.0		95.0%		1000.0	1062.9			106.3%
La	N/A		<DL									
Li	N/A		<DL									
Mg	56.1	9.9%		58.4								
Mn	1.1	14.8%	16.87	17.9		99.6%		10.0	11.3			112.5%
Mo	21.0	4.7%		20.7								
Na	69912.8	0.9%	1687.33	70944.3		61.1% #		1000.0	1073.1			107.3%
Nd	N/A		<DL									
Ni	442.0	2.2%	84.37	536.6		112.1% #		50.0	56.7			113.5%
Pb	N/A		843.67	781.7		92.7%		500.0	491.8			98.4%
Re	N/A		<DL									
Rh	N/A		<DL									
Ru	N/A		<DL									
Sb	N/A		<DL									
Se	N/A		501.4									
Si	112.7	6.4%	843.67	1088.4		115.7%		500.0	620.3			124.1%
Sr	1.4	9.0%		1.5								
Te	N/A		<DL									
Th	N/A		<DL									
Ti	2.5	13.0%		(2.4)								
Tl	N/A		<DL									
U	928.1	0.8%	1687.33	2500.7		93.2%		1000.0	981.8			98.2%
V	N/A		84.37	86.6		102.6%		50.0	51.8			103.6%
Zn	4.2	23.1% *		4.0								
Zr	N/A		84.37	76.6		90.8%		50.0	44.9			89.8%
P	3959.2	0.9%		3885.4								
Bi	N/A		843.67					500.0				

Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 3) The process "Blank" has been subtracted from the "Spike + Sample" and "Spike Control" results.
 4) Spike Flag (#): Spike is less than 25% of sample concentration; %recovery for information only.
 5) 20% Flag (*): RPD > 20% and both sample and duplicate results > QL.

09/17/92

ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

Table 2-2c: SST Core 35, ICP Core Composite Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** Sample Results *****

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 09/15/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 1 of 2

Samp Log#:	92-08169f1	92-08169f1	92-08169f2	92-08169f2	92-06774a3							***Estimated***	
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00							DL	QL
ug/g Factor	175.69	878.43	188.54	942.68	272.83							DL	QL
ICP Run #	1155	1157	1156	1158	1150							DL	QL
	Sample	Sample	Dupl.	Dupl.	Blank	Blank	%Dif	%Dif	%Dif	%Dif	%Dif	ug/mL	ug/mL
	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g							
Ag	<DL	<DL	<DL	<DL	<DL	<DL						0.0078	0.0261
Al J	37836.1	38786.5	3%	51344.5	53336.8	4%	<DL					0.1829	0.6096
As	73.1	<DL		(51.3)	(134.3)	162%	<DL					0.1014	0.3379
B	106.4	(110.4)	4%	102.7	(106.4)	4%	119.4					0.0596	0.1987
Ba	102.0	104.6	3%	92.1	95.6	4%	<DL					0.0080	0.0267
Be J	7.4	(7.6)	3%	5.9	(6.1)	5%	<DL					0.0032	0.0107
Ca	12422.0	14380.9	16%	10673.4	12335.4	16%	677.8					0.0016	0.0054
Cd	29.7	29.8	0%	25.3	24.9	2%	<DL					0.0075	0.0250
Ce	214.3	(209.5)	2%	224.2	(216.8)	3%	<DL					0.1019	0.3396
Co	(86.2)	<DL		(83.4)	<DL	<DL						0.1865	0.6217
Cr	200.0	211.2	6%	211.8	226.8	7%	<DL					0.0113	0.0378
Cu	45.4	47.5	5%	45.3	48.5	7%	(3.1)					0.0088	0.0294
Dy	(1.9)	<DL		(2.0)	<DL	<DL						0.0053	0.0176
Fe	27892.5	29559.0	6%	24166.2	16388.8	32%	26.7					0.0100	0.0334
K	476.3	(566.6)	19%	412.5	(517.7)	26%	<DL					0.3173	1.0576
La	140.0	144.8	3%	155.4	163.2	5%	<DL					0.0124	0.0414
Li	8.4	(8.9)	5%	6.9	(8.2)	18%	<DL					0.0074	0.0246
Mg	794.2	839.9	6%	763.3	814.4	7%	94.0					0.0003	0.0009
Mn	303.8	319.4	5%	298.8	317.4	6%	1.1					0.0010	0.0034
Mo	38.6	42.2	9%	37.4	(39.7)	6%	<DL					0.0128	0.0427
Na	76361.6	78526.0	3%	65282.8	68181.6	4%	361.1					0.0587	0.1957
Nd	261.5	268.6	3%	272.5	291.7	7%	<DL					0.0496	0.1653
Ni	11707.1	12507.9	7%	10397.1	11246.2	8%	<DL					0.0231	0.0768
Pb	3904.3	4061.9	4%	3738.9	4013.4	7%	<DL					0.0831	0.2771
Re	(4.2)	<DL		(3.6)	<DL	<DL						0.0173	0.0576
Rh	(24.6)	<DL		(16.7)	<DL	<DL						0.0821	0.2738
Ru J	49.4	(37.0)	25%	37.5	(108.3)	189%	<DL					0.0350	0.1167
Sb J	200.7	156.4	22%	150.8	(139.7)	7%	<DL					0.0475	0.1584
Se J	114.3	<DL		176.7	(197.9)	12%	<DL					0.1515	0.5050
Si	2409.4	2434.9	1%	2588.3	2674.0	3%	69.9					0.0549	0.1830
Sr	413.0	425.8	3%	356.5	372.5	4%	2.3					0.0004	0.0013
Te	(22.2)	<DL		(31.6)	<DL	<DL						0.0950	0.3168
Th	189.8	(197.7)	4%	155.9	(151.2)	3%	<DL					0.0734	0.2448
Ti	82.5	83.2	1%	82.3	85.9	4%	(4.8)					0.0054	0.0179
Tl J	859.2	(998.7)	16%	689.7	(845.6)	23%	<DL					0.5492	1.8308
U J	89548.5	90961.0	2%	68789.6	70727.8	3%	<DL					0.5376	1.7920
V	25.9	26.8	3%	23.7	(23.4)	1%	<DL					0.0090	0.0301
Zn	312.0	332.7	7%	293.7	318.0	8%	4.4					0.0041	0.0136
Zr	11.0	(11.2)	2%	10.4	(10.8)	4%	<DL					0.0076	0.0253
P	20995.7	21481.7	2%	16621.5	17361.1	4%	<DL					0.6133	2.0442
Bi													

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) The process "Blank" has not been subtracted from the "Sample & Duplicate" results.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) "Estimated" Sample Detection Limit (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) Samples batched with 92-06774 (blank & spike control included); see 92-06774 for additional QC information.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/15/92

09/17/92

WHC-SD-WM-UP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

Table 2-2a: SST Core 35, ICP Core Composite Acid Digestion
QC Results

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** QC Results *****

Analyzed: 09/15/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 2 of 2

Samp Log#:
Dilution:
ug/g Factor:
ICP Run #:

92-06774a5
1.00
100.00
1151

92-8168											
Ave f1&f2	20%	Spike	Spike+	Spike+				Spike	Spike	Spike	
ug/g	RPD	Added	Sample	Sample	% Dif	XRec	Flag	STD	Control	Control	% Dif
ug/g	Flag	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g				ug/mL	ug/mL	ug/mL	XRec
Ag	N/A							50.0	46.1		92.1%
Al	44590.3	30.3%	*					250.0	251.8		100.7%
As	62.2	35.1%									
B	104.5	3.5%									
Ba	97.0	10.2%						50.0	48.5		96.9%
Be	6.6	22.7%	*					5.0	4.8		95.5%
Ca	11547.7	15.1%						500.0	494.6		98.9%
Cd	27.5	16.1%						25.0	24.6		98.5%
Ce	219.3	4.5%									
Co	84.8	3.3%									
Cr	205.9	5.7%						50.0	54.5		109.0%
Cu	45.3	0.1%									
Dy	1.9	5.2%									
Fe	26029.4	14.3%						50.0	51.2		102.3%
K	444.4	14.3%						1000.0	1062.9		106.3%
La	147.7	10.5%									
Li	7.7	19.2%									
Mg	778.7	4.0%									
Mn	301.3	1.7%						10.0	11.3		112.5%
Mo	38.0	3.2%									
Na	70822.2	15.6%						1000.0	1073.1		107.3%
Nd	267.0	4.1%									
Ni	11052.1	11.9%						50.0	56.7		113.5%
Pb	3821.6	4.3%						500.0	491.8		98.4%
Re	3.9	16.8%									
Rh	20.7	38.2%									
Ru	43.4	27.4%	*								
Sb	175.7	28.4%	*								
Se	145.5	42.9%	*								
Si	2498.9	7.2%						500.0	620.3		124.1%
Sr	384.7	14.7%									
Te	26.9	35.2%									
Th	172.8	19.6%									
Ti	82.4	0.3%									
Tl	774.4	21.9%	*								
U	79169.0	26.2%	*					1000.0	981.8		98.2%
V	24.8	8.9%						50.0	51.8		103.6%
Zn	302.8	6.0%									
Zr	10.7	6.1%						50.0	44.9		89.8%
P	18808.6	23.3%	*								
Bi	N/A							500.0			

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
3) The process "Blank" has been subtracted from the "Spike + Sample" and "Spike Control" results.
4) Spike Flag (#): Spike is less than 25% of sample concentration; %recovery for information only.
5) 20% Flag (*): RPD > 20% and both sample and duplicate results > QL.
6) 92-06774 QC samples batched with 92-8169f1/f2.

09/17/92

Table 2-2e: SST Core 35, ICP Quarter Segment 2D Top Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 09/11/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-08167a	92-08167a	92-08167b	92-08167b	92-06776	92-06776			92-08167a	92-08167b		
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00			Average			
ug/g Factor	201.1	1005.4	194.1	970.7	197.6	987.8	***Estimated***				20%	
ICP Run #	1106	1117	1107	1118	1105	1116	DL	QL			RPD	Flg
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	X Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	X Dif	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)			
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	35097.2	36327.6	4%	35750.5	37150.2	4%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	35423.9	1.8%
As	(46.4)	<DL		(35.9)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	41.1	25.5%
B	123.3	(143.9)		105.1	(118.9)		114.4	(138.4)	0.0596	0.1987	114.2	15.9%
Ba	98.7	104.1	5%	95.0	99.7	5%	<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	96.9	3.8%
Be	7.3	(7.4)		7.1	(7.5)		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	7.2	2.4%
Ca	12161.8	13947.8	15%	11797.7	13584.1	15%	470.0	495.8	0.0016	0.0054	11979.8	3.0%
Cd	29.3	32.5	11%	28.7	30.9	8%	<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	29.0	2.2%
Ce	214.5	(226.4)		208.8	(231.0)		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	211.6	2.7%
Co	(81.9)	<DL		(81.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	81.8	0.2%
Cr	185.5	201.7	9%	188.2	204.2	8%	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	186.9	1.5%
Cu	47.1	50.7	8%	46.1	50.2	9%	<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	46.6	2.2%
Dy	(2.3)	<DL		(2.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	2.4	9.5%
Fe	28603.2	30676.0	7%	25805.9	27678.4	7%	11.3	(23.2)	0.0100	0.0334	27204.6	10.3%
K	497.9	(579.4)		497.7	(534.0)		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	497.8	0.0%
La	132.5	139.9	6%	130.5	138.9	6%	<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	131.5	1.5%
Li	8.5	(10.9)		8.2	(9.6)		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	8.3	4.2%
Mg	776.1	833.6	7%	746.1	801.1	7%	64.3	66.1	0.0003	0.0009	761.1	4.0%
Mn	301.8	321.6	7%	287.3	597.3	108%	(0.3)	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	294.5	4.9%
Mo	37.3	43.5	17%	36.6	42.0	15%	<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	36.9	1.8%
Na	68701.0	71348.3	4%	69415.6	72415.1	4%	276.9	307.8	0.0587	0.1957	69058.3	1.0%
Nd	247.4	270.4	9%	248.9	268.0	8%	<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	248.2	0.6%
Ni	11286.7	12271.3	9%	10978.3	11931.7	9%	<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	11132.5	2.8%
Pb	3865.3	4175.4	8%	3795.6	4112.4	8%	<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	3830.5	1.8%
Re	(4.4)	<DL		(4.4)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	4.4	0.4%
Rh	(28.3)	<DL		(32.2)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	30.3	12.9%
Ru	50.8	(74.2)		50.8	(66.5)		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	50.8	0.1%
Sb	206.6	226.9	10%	200.2	221.0	10%	<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	203.4	3.2%
Se	116.8	<DL		113.5	(149.5)		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	115.2	2.9%
Si	2854.9	2953.4	3%	2005.2	2075.9	4%	58.2	(68.7)	0.0549	0.1830	2430.0	35.0% *
Sr	395.1	414.2	5%	383.8	403.9	5%	1.6	1.9	0.0004	0.0013	389.4	2.9%
Te	(26.1)	<DL		(23.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	24.9	10.1%
Th	178.4	(188.9)		176.3	(141.5)		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	177.4	1.2%
Ti	79.5	85.3	7%	78.8	81.5	3%	(2.3)	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	79.2	0.9%
Tl	495.3	<DL		531.9	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	513.6	7.1%
U	86499.1	89542.5	4%	84818.5	88218.8	4%	<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	85658.8	2.0%
V	26.3	(29.5)		25.5	(29.2)		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	25.9	2.9%
Zn	307.6	334.1	9%	294.5	318.7	8%	(2.0)	(4.2)	0.0041	0.0136	301.1	4.4%
Zr	11.9	(15.8)		11.0	(13.8)		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	11.4	8.5%
P	19290.2	20662.5	7%	18971.5	20192.0	6%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	19130.8	1.7%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/11/92

09/17/92

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

Table 2-2f: SST Core 35, ICP Quarter Segment 2D Bottom Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 09/11/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-08168a	92-08168a	92-08168b	92-08168b	92-06776	92-06776						
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00						
ug/g Factor	185.5	927.5	201.8	1008.9	193.3	966.5	***Estimated***	92-08168a				
ICP Run #	1108	1119	1109	1120	1105	1116	DL	QL	92-08168b			
									Average			
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	30843.2	31912.9	3%	31431.3	32430.9	3%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	31137.2	1.9%
As	(44.3)	<DL		(44.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	44.5	0.9%
B	83.5	(94.3)		112.2	(123.5)		111.9	(135.4)	0.0596	0.1987	97.9	29.3% *
Ba	87.4	91.9	5%	93.2	98.3	5%	<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	90.3	6.4%
Be	6.5	(6.8)		6.9	(7.2)		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	6.7	4.7%
Ca	10915.8	12479.2	14%	11641.2	13242.0	14%	459.9	485.1	0.0016	0.0054	11278.5	6.4%
Cd	26.1	28.0	7%	27.7	29.8	8%	<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	26.9	5.9%
Ce	194.0	(195.4)		204.7	(222.2)		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	199.3	5.4%
Co	(77.0)	<DL		(80.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	78.8	4.7%
Cr	177.1	187.8	6%	192.2	205.2	7%	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	184.7	8.2%
Cu	42.9	45.2	5%	42.8	49.3	15%	<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	42.8	0.3%
Dy	(2.6)	<DL		(2.6)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	2.6	1.1%
Fe	23399.2	24944.0	7%	25480.8	27036.4	6%	11.0	(22.7)	0.0100	0.0334	24440.0	8.5%
K	443.0	(485.9)		462.4	(511.0)		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	452.7	4.3%
La	117.5	122.4	4%	124.9	130.5	4%	<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	121.2	6.1%
Li	7.5	(9.6)		8.2	(10.7)		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	7.8	8.4%
Mg	689.4	735.5	7%	731.6	780.1	7%	62.9	64.7	0.0003	0.0009	710.5	5.9%
Mn	257.4	273.0	6%	277.4	293.1	6%	(0.3)	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	267.4	7.5%
Mo	34.3	(35.8)		38.0	(37.8)		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	36.2	10.2%
Na	66796.5	69537.2	4%	71331.7	74040.6	4%	270.9	301.2	0.0587	0.1957	69064.1	6.6%
Nd	226.0	222.7	1%	238.3	252.6	6%	<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	232.2	5.3%
Ni	10211.3	11043.4	8%	10757.5	11623.3	8%	<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	10484.4	5.2%
Pb	3460.8	3695.8	7%	3977.9	4244.7	7%	<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	3719.4	13.9%
Re	(4.3)	<DL		(3.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	4.0	14.4%
Rh	(32.0)	<DL		(31.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	31.9	1.1%
Ru	46.8	(60.1)		47.9	(61.2)		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	47.4	2.4%
Sb	180.0	211.9	18%	186.4	224.5	20%	<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	183.2	3.5%
Se	107.0	<DL		(98.4)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	102.7	8.4%
Si	1819.7	1883.2	3%	2634.9	2720.1	3%	56.9	(67.2)	0.0549	0.1830	2227.3	36.6% *
Sr	351.9	368.5	5%	374.9	391.5	4%	1.5	1.8	0.0004	0.0013	363.4	6.3%
Te	(23.4)	<DL		(23.2)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	23.3	0.7%
Th	164.0	(157.0)		170.1	(198.5)		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	167.0	3.7%
Ti	69.6	73.4	5%	75.1	79.7	6%	(2.2)	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	72.4	7.6%
Tl	496.4	<DL		569.3	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	532.8	13.7%
U	77991.1	80742.0	4%	81652.5	84391.6	3%	<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	79821.8	4.6%
V	23.3	(25.0)		25.1	(27.9)		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	24.2	7.6%
Zn	293.8	317.1	8%	289.4	316.8	9%	(2.0)	(4.2)	0.0041	0.0136	291.6	1.5%
Zr	9.8	(11.8)		12.2	(15.3)		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	11.0	21.9% *
P	17637.9	18789.8	7%	18878.7	19787.8	5%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	18258.3	6.8%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/11/92

09/17/92

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

Table 2-3a: SST Core 35, Drainable Liquid Water Leach

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Water Leach

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 09/14/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6774c1	92-6774c2	92-8969b5			92-6774c1	92-6774c2			20%		
Dilution:	2.00	2.00	2.00			DL	QL			RPD Flg		
ug/g Factor	190.0	185.5	187.7			***Estimated***	Average					
ICP Run #	1133	1134	1130			DL	QL					
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	%Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	%Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	
Ag	<DL	<DL		(1.7)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	N/A	
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	N/A	
B	(20.2)	<DL		(17.8)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987	19.0	12.7%
Ba	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	N/A	
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	N/A	
Ca	43.7	36.8		59.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0016	0.0054	40.3	17.3%
Cd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	N/A	
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	N/A	
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	154.2	155.0		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	154.6	0.5%
Cu	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	N/A	
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	N/A	
Fe	787.7	791.2		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0100	0.0334	789.5	0.4%
K	457.2	465.8		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	461.5	1.9%
La	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	N/A	
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	N/A	
Mg	24.0	21.5		13.7	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0003	0.0009	22.8	11.2%
Mn	(0.3)	(0.3)		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	0.3	2.4%
Mo	21.0	21.4		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	21.2	2.2%
Na	71151.7	71499.5		38.9	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0587	0.1957	71325.6	0.5%
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	N/A	
Ni	491.3	492.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	492.0	0.3%
Pb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	N/A	
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	N/A	
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	N/A	
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	N/A	
Si	(28.6)	(22.0)		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0549	0.1830	25.3	26.1%
Sr	0.3	0.3		0.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0004	0.0013	0.3	14.9%
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	N/A	
Ti	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	N/A	
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	977.9	980.9		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	979.4	0.3%
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	N/A	
Zn	2.6	2.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0041	0.0136	2.6	1.2%
Zr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	N/A	
P	3986.3	4110.8		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	4048.6	3.1%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% "RPD" flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.
8) Blank 92-8169b3 batched with sample and duplicate.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/14/92

09/17/92

9312045.0334

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

Table 2-3b: SST Core 35, Core Composite Water Leach

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Water Leach

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 09/14/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-8169b1	92-8169b2	92-8169b5							92-8169b1		
Dilution:	2.00	2.00	2.00							92-8169b2		
ug/g Factor	196.1	202.9	199.5							Average		
ICP Run #	1132	1131	1130						***Estimated***			
									DL	QL		
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	%Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	%Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	333.1	327.5		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	330.3	1.7%
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	N/A	
B	(15.3)	(19.1)		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987	17.2	22.0%
Ba	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	N/A	
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	N/A	
Ca	303.8	373.7		<DL	62.9		<DL	<DL	0.0016	0.0054	338.8	20.6% *
Cd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	N/A	
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	N/A	
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A	
Cr	131.9	131.5		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	131.7	0.3%
Cu	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	N/A	
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	N/A	
Fe	702.5	721.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0100	0.0334	712.1	2.7%
K	352.2	343.2		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	347.7	2.6%
La	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	N/A	
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	N/A	
Mg	31.4	32.1		<DL	14.6		<DL	<DL	0.0003	0.0009	31.7	2.4%
Mn	0.8	1.0		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	0.9	19.1%
Mo	16.0	15.6		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	15.8	2.8%
Na	60688.5	60363.5		<DL	41.3		<DL	<DL	0.0587	0.1957	60526.0	0.5%
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	N/A	
Ni	402.6	410.6		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	406.6	2.0%
Pb	(17.5)	(22.9)		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	20.2	27.0%
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	N/A	
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A	
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A	
Sb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	N/A	
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	N/A	
Si	58.0	63.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0549	0.1830	60.8	9.4%
Sr	4.5	5.8		<DL	0.3		<DL	<DL	0.0004	0.0013	5.2	25.0% *
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A	
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	N/A	
Ti	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	N/A	
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	N/A	
U	476.4	443.9		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	460.1	7.1%
V	(2.5)	(2.7)		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	2.6	5.6%
Zn	3.0	3.5		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0041	0.0136	3.3	15.7%
Zr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	N/A	
P	5704.6	5555.6		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	5630.1	2.6%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 09/14/92

09/17/92

Table 2-4a: SST Core 35, IC Fluoride

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

FLUORIDE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		600							
92-06761-B	500	400	22%	600	270	37%	230	92%	30
92-06762-B	500	600	0%						
92-06763-B	600	500	0%						
92-06764-B	400	400	0%						
92-06765-B	400	400	0%						
92-06766-B	1100	1200	9%						
92-06767-C	600	400	22%	700	250	80%	200	80%	< 60
92-06774-C	300	300	0%						
92-08169-B J	300	300	0%	400	250	40%	210	84%	< 60
							TRUE = 250 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4b: SST Core 35, IC Chloride

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

CHLORIDE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		1200							
92-06761-B	900	900	0%	1200	270	111%	240	96%	< 30
92-06762-B	900	1000	11%						
92-06763-B	900	900	0%						
92-06764-B	600	600	0%						
92-06765-B	700	600	15%						
92-06766-B	700	700	0%						
92-06767-C	1200	900	29%	1100	250	-40%	230	92%	< 80
92-06774-C	900	900	0%						
92-08169-B	800	700	13%	1000	250	80%	330	132%	< 60
							TRUE= 250 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.) / sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample) / spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

Table 2-4c: SST Core 35, IC Nitrite

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

NITRITE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		65000							
92-06761-B	50000	46000	8%	63000	16200	80%	13700	91%	< 50
92-06762-B	49000	53000	8%						
92-06763-B	48000	49000	2%						
92-06764-B	31000	29000	7%						
92-06765-B	33000	31000	6%						
92-06766-B	35000	35000	0%						
92-06767-C	64000	41000	44%	55000	114900	-60%	12800	85%	< 200
92-06774-C	46000	46000	0%						
92-08169-B	34000	35000	3%	49000	15000	100%	12500	83%	< 100
							TRUE = 15000 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.) / sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample) / spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4d: SST Core 35, IC Nitrate

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

NITRATE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		82000							
92-06761-B	64000	60000	8%	86000	21600	102%	21300	107%	< 50
92-06762-B	64000	69000	8%						
92-06763-B	66000	66000	0%						
92-06764-B	43000	42000	2%						
92-06765-B	48000	44000	9%						
92-06766-B	51000	51000	0%						
92-06767-C	87000	86000	43%	78000	19900	-45%	21100	106%	< 200
92-06774-C	58000	59000	2%						
92-08169-B J	43000	44000	2%	70000	19900	136%	22300	112%	< 100
							TRUE= 20000 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.) / sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample) / spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4e: SST Core 35, IC Phosphate

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

PHOSPHATE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		19200							
92-06761-B	17700	15500	13%	21000	9770	88%	3480	99%	< 50
92-06762-B	16600	19000	13%						
92-06763-B	23300	22400	4%						
92-06764-B	20400	20400	0%						
92-06765-B	38000	43000	12%						
92-06766-B	54000	56000	4%						
92-06767-C	60000	39000	42%	48000	3500	-343%	3400	97%	< 200
92-06774-C	12900	13000	1%						
92-08169-B J	18100	17600	3%	22600	3500	129%	3400	97%	< 100
							TRUE= 3500 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4f: SST Core 35, Sulfate

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

SULFATE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		15700							
92-06761-B	12600	11500	9%	16600	14040	99%	3760	100%	< 50
92-06762-B	12500	13500	8%						
92-06763-B	12500	12300	2%						
92-06764-B	8300	7800	6%						
92-06765-B	8900	8300	7%						
92-06766-B	9500	9500	0%						
92-06767-C	16200	11200	36%	14100	3700	-57%	3600	96%	< 200
92-06774-C	10900	10900	0%						
92-08169-B	8600	8600	0%	13100	3700	122%	3700	99%	< 100
							TRUE= 3750 ug/mL		

NOTES:

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4g: SST Core 35, Free Cyanide

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

free CN

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		1790							
92-06761-B	1150	1020	12%						< 1
92-06762-B	1140	1200	5%						
92-06763-B	1220	1130	8%						
92-06764-B	730	740	1%						
92-06765-B	860	780	10%						
92-06766-B	880	920	4%						
92-06767-C	1590	1040	42%						< 2
92-06774-C	1030	1020	1%						
92-08169-B	770	790	3%						< 1

THERE ARE NO SPIKES OR SPIKE CONTROLS FOR THIS SET OF DATA.

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-5: GFAA, Hg, Cr(VI) and NH₃-N Inorganic Results

GFAA: Acid Digestion -- Drainable Liquid

Arsenic	92-06774-B6 sample	<0.5 µg/g
	-B7 duplicate	<0.6 µg/g
	-B8 proc. blk.	<0.6 µg/g
	-B9 spike	2.05 µg/g (48% Recovery)
	-B10 control	1.48 µg/ml (59% Recovery)

Selenium	92-06774-B6 sample	<0.6 µg/g
	-B7 duplicate	<0.7 µg/g
	-B8 proc. blk.	<0.6 µg/g
	-B9 spike	1.62 µg/g (38% Recovery)
	-B10 control	1.02 µg/ml (41% Recovery)

Antimony	92-06774-A1 sample	<0.3 µg/g
	-A2 duplicate	<0.3 µg/g
	-A3 proc. blk.	<0.3 µg/g
	-A4 spike	4.10 µg/g (97% Recovery)
	-A5 control	2.36 µg/ml (94% Recovery)

Note: As and Se predigestion spike recoveries do not meet the 75-125% recovery criteria. Therefore, the results for all samples may be biased low.

Mercury: Drainable Liquid

92-06774-D1 sample	1.3 µg/g
-D2 duplicate	1.4 µg/g
-D3 spike	(N/A--spike <<25% sample)
-D4 control	1.00 µg/L (100% Recovery)
-D5 proc. blk.	<0.1 µg/g

Chromium(VI): Drainable Liquid

92-06774-C1 sample	93 µg/g (rerun = 79 µg/g)
-C2 duplicate	93 µg/g
92-08169-B5 proc. blk.	<26 µg/g

Ammonia (NH₃-N): Drainable Liquid

92-06767-C1 sample	<5.0 µg/g
-C2 duplicate	<5.0 µg/g

Ammonia (NH₃-N): Water Leach -- Core Composite (Seq 2)

92-08169-B1 sample	5.1 µg/g
-B2 duplicate	<5.1 µg/g
-B5 proc. blk.	<5.7 µg/g

Table 2-6: TOC/TIC/TC Results

	<u>TOC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)</u>	<u>TIC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)</u>	<u>TC ($\mu\text{g/g}$)</u>
<u>Direct -- Quarter Segment 2D</u>			
92-08169-C1 sample	2200	3800	6000
-C2 duplicate	2900	3600	6500

Direct -- Drainable Liquid

92-06774-C1 sample	1200	4900	6100
-C2 duplicate	1600	4500	6100
92-08169-B5 blank	<50	300	300

Water Leach -- Core Composite (Seq Z)

92-08169-C1 sample	1000	5200	6200
-C2 duplicate	1300	4600	5900
92-08169-B5 blank	<50	300	300

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

CORE 35

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

Table 3-2a: SST Core 35, Uranium Analysis Results

Sample ID	*	Uranium $\mu\text{g/g}$	+/- % error
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite			
92-06774-B-1	A/smp	1.01E+3	10
92-06774-B-2	A/dup	8.96E+2	10
92-06774-B-3	A/blk	<2E+2	
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)		107	
BLANK		<6E-3	
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite			
92-08169-A-1	F/smp	4.31E+4	10
92-08169-A-2	F/dup	4.55E+4	10
92-08169-A-3	F/blk	<5E+1	
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)		99	
BLANK		<4E-4	
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite			
92-06774-C-1	W/smp	8.85E+2	10
92-06774-C-2	W/dup	1.06E+3	10
92-06774-C-3	W/blk	<8E+2	
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)		107	
BLANK		<6E-3	

* A = acid, F = Fusion, W = water, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

Table 3-2b: SST Core 35, Alpha Analysis Results

Sample ID	*	Tot Alpha $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Pu-238 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Pu-239/240 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Am-241 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Np-237 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite											
92-06774-B-1	F/smp	7.82E-4 J	19								
92-06774-B-2	F/dup	8.58E-4	18								
92-06774-B-3	F/blk	<2E-4									
92-06774-C-1	W/smp			** J		** J		4.24E-6 J	29	<2E-6 J	
92-06774-C-2	W/dup			**		**		7.86E-6	29	<2E-6	
92-06774-C-3	W/blk			ND		8.8E-6	18	<3E-6		1.43E-6	56
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)						96		100		90	
BLANK ($\mu\text{Ci/ml}$)						2.3E-6		<6E-7		<3E-7	
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite											
92-08196-A-1	F/smp	1.15 J	8	1.30E-2 J	12	1.47E-1 J	9	7.19E-1 J	7	1.05E-3 J	14
92-08196-A-2	F/dup	1.21	8	1.43E-2	13	1.55E-1	9	8.06E-1	7	1.34E-3	12
92-08196-A-3	F/blk	<5E-4				2.02E-4	79	<3E-3		<1E-4	56
92-08196-B-1	W/smp	7.34E-3 J	8								
92-08196-B-2	W/dup	9.58E-3	7								
92-08196-B-5	W/blk	<1E-4									
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)						96		95		89	
BLANK ($\mu\text{Ci/ml}$)						<5E-7		<6E-7		<3E-7	

* A = acid, F = Fusion, W = water, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** Pu results are from three sample preparations with poor agreement between samples or duplicate analysis of the same sample. The range for Pu-239+240 is 3.0E-5 to 1.8E-4 with an average of 1.2E-4 and from 2.2E-6 to 1.1E-5 with an average of 5.1E-6 for Pu-238. Uncertainty for the averages is +/- 50%.

Table 3-2c: SST Core 35, Beta Analysis Results

Sample ID	*	Tot Beta $\mu\text{Ci/g}^{**}$	+/- % error	Sr-90 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Tc-99 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite							
92-06774-B-1	A/smp	4.83E-1 \overline{J}	3	2.27E-1 \overline{J}	9	8.29E-2 \overline{J}	11
92-06774-B-2	A/dup	4.72E-1	3	2.32E-1	8	8.44E-2	11
92-06774-B-3	A/blk	<4E-4		<6E-3		<7E-4	
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)				102		98	
BLANK ($\mu\text{Ci/ml}$)				<6E-5		<8E-6	
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite							
92-08169-A-1	F/smp	7.08E+3 \overline{J}	4	3.22E+3 \overline{J}	8	1.00E-1 \overline{J}	23
92-08169-A-2	F/dup	6.87E+3	4	3.20E+3	8	9.42E-2	25
92-08169-A-3	F/blk	4.57E-2	11	<3E-1		1.02E-3	69
92-08169-B-1	W/smp	5.02E+1 \overline{J}	3				
92-08169-B-2	W/dup	6.26E+1	3				
92-08169-B-5	W/blk	<3E-2					
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)				100		101	
BLANK ($\mu\text{Ci/ml}$)				<5E-5		<3E-6	

* A = acid, F = Fusion, W = water, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** Calculated as $^{90}\text{Sr} + ^{90}\text{Y}$

Table 3-2d: SST Core 35, Liquid Scintillation Counting Analysis Results

Sample ID	C-14 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	H-3 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Se-79 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite						
92-06774-C-1 W/smp			2.09E-3	4		
92-06774-C-2 W/dup			2.04E-3	4		
92-06774-C-3 W/blk			<5E-5			
92-06774-B-1 A/smp					2.06E-4	18
92-06774-B-2 A/dup					2.21E-4	16
92-06774-B-3 A/blk					<6E-5	
92-06774-G-1 D/smp	1.3E-3 $\mu\text{Ci/ml}$	12				
92-06774-G-2 D/dup	1.3E-3 $\mu\text{Ci/ml}$	12				
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)			96			
BLANK ($\mu\text{Ci/ml}$)			9.66E-6			
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite						
92-08169-A-1 F/smp					<9E-4	
92-08169-A-2 F/dup					8.7E-4	56
92-08169-A-3 F/blk					<2E-4	
92-08169-B-1 W/smp			1.94E-2	4		
92-08169-B-2 W/dup			1.76E-2	3		
92-08169-B-5 W/blk			3.70E-2	3		
92-08169-J-1 D/smp	8.0E-3	12				
92-08169-J-2 D/dup	3.5E-3	12				
92-08169-J-3 D/blk	2.0E-4	12				
STANDARD (% RECOVERY)			105			
BLANK ($\mu\text{Ci/ml}$)			<8E-7		<4E-7	

* A = acid, F = Fusion, W = water, D = direct, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

Table 3-2e: SST Core 35, Ni-59/63 Analysis Results

Sample ID	*	Ni-59 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error	Ni-63 $\mu\text{Ci/g}$	+/- % error
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite					
92-06774-B-1	A/smp	1.27E-1J	27	1.37E+1J	6
92-06774-B-2	A/dup	NA**	NA**	NA**	NA**
92-06774-B-3	A/blk	<2E-3		4.34E-3	29
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite					
92-08169-A-1	F/smp	1.44E-2J	26	1.28 J	6
92-08169-A-2	F/dup	1.22E-2	31	1.29	6
92-08169-A-3	F/blk	<6.1E-3		6.47E-3	25

* A = acid, F = Fusion, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** Not Analyzed

Table 3-3: SST Core 35, U MS Isotopic Mass Percent

Sample ID	*	234	235	236	238
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite					
92-06774-C-1	W/smp	0.0052 J	0.6726 J	0.0087 J	99.3135 J
92-06774-C-2	W/dup	0.0061	0.6682	0.0078	99.3179
92-06774-C-3	W/blk	NA**	NA**	NA**	NA**
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite					
92-08169-A-1	F/smp	0.0060 J	0.6832 J	0.0059 J	99.3048 J
92-08169-A-2	F/dup	0.0054	0.6803	0.0059	99.3084
92-08169-A-3	F/blk	NA**	NA**	NA**	NA**

Table 3-3: Pu MS Isotopic Mass Percent (continued)

Sample ID	*	238	239	240	241	242
<hr/>						
Core 35 - Drainable Liquid Composite						
92-06774-C-1	W/smp	Pu concentration insufficient for Pu Mass Spec analysis.				
92-06774-C-2	W/dup					
92-06774-C-3	W/blk					
Core 35 - Solid Core Composite						
92-08169-A-1	F/smp	Pu concentration insufficient for Pu Mass Spec analysis.				
92-08169-A-2	F/dup					
92-08169-A-3	F/blk					

* A = acid, F = Fusion, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

** Not Analyzed

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 35

WTC-CP-V04V Rev. 1

Table 2-1a: SST Core 36, ICP Core Composite Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** Sample Results *****

Analyzed Date: 08/11/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 1 of 2

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

Samp Log#:	92-06767a1	92-06767a1	92-06767a2	92-06767a2	92-06767a5						
Dilution:	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	1.00						
ug/g Factor	199.92	999.60	199.28	996.41	198.45						
ICP Run #	1028	1035	1027	1034	1025	1032	***Estimated***				
	Sample	Sample	Dupl.	Dupl.	Blank	Blank	DL	DL			
	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/g	ug/mL	ug/mL			
Ag	<DL	<DL	<DL	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261			
Al	5384.5	5267.1	2X	5667.0	5580.4	2X	0.1829	0.6096			
As	121.7	(123.6)	1X	114.0	(175.6)	54X	0.1014	0.3379			
B	150.4	(145.1)	4X	135.5	(132.5)	2X	0.0596	0.1987			
Ba	43.1	42.5	1X	42.7	42.4	1X	0.0080	0.0267			
Be	8.3	(8.3)	0X	6.9	(7.0)	1X	0.0032	0.0107			
Ca	16174.2	17980.9	11X	17888.0	20247.4	13X	0.0016	0.0054			
Cd	26.5	25.2	5X	23.8	(24.1)	2X	0.0075	0.0250			
Ce	84.2	<DL		69.9	<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396			
Co	(71.0)	<DL		(64.6)	<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217			
Cr	211.7	211.8	0X	221.3	222.7	1X	0.0113	0.0378			
Cu	8.4	<DL		9.6	(9.4)	1X	0.0088	0.0294			
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176			
Fe	19599.6	19885.6	1X	19314.7	19682.5	2X	0.0100	0.0334			
K	646.1	(500.2)	23X	644.1	(561.0)	13X	0.3173	1.0576			
La	17.3	(14.5)	16X	17.7	(17.8)	0X	0.0124	0.0414			
Li	7.8	<DL		7.5	(7.6)	1X	0.0074	0.0246			
Mg	548.8	557.8	2X	533.5	545.1	2X	0.0003	0.0009			
Mn	147.3	148.0	0X	142.6	144.4	1X	0.0010	0.0034			
Mo	37.4	(38.7)	4X	37.5	(36.8)	2X	0.0128	0.0427			
Na	102728.9	101609.4	1X	102863.7	102331.6	1X	0.0587	0.1957			
Nd	62.1	(76.7)	24X	56.3	(84.6)	50X	0.0496	0.1653			
Ni	9619.8	9899.1	3X	11511.4	11903.1	3X	0.0231	0.0768			
Pb	840.2	890.2	6X	912.5	927.2	2X	0.0831	0.2771			
Re	(4.6)	<DL		(6.7)	<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576			
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738			
Ru	55.6	<DL		45.7	<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167			
Sb	193.9	208.4	7X	171.8	187.6	9X	0.0475	0.1584			
Se	(43.8)	<DL		(61.5)	<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050			
Si	882.5	734.2	17X	803.3	638.3	21X	0.0549	0.1830			
Sr	349.8	348.5	0X	293.7	294.3	0X	0.0004	0.0013			
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168			
Th	97.6	<DL		91.8	(73.8)	20X	0.0734	0.2448			
Ti	26.5	25.7	3X	24.5	22.8	7X	0.0054	0.0179			
Tl	(316.8)	(608.5)	92X	(306.6)	(949.1)	210X	0.5492	1.8308			
U	91473.4	89782.1	2X	76301.3	75495.2	1X	0.5376	1.7920			
V	10.2	(11.9)	17X	10.5	(12.9)	24X	0.0090	0.0301			
Zn	191.5	197.4	3X	206.0	212.3	3X	0.0041	0.0136			
Zr	31.6	30.7	3X	28.2	27.3	3X	0.0076	0.0253			
P	31795.8	31636.5	1X	29882.1	30018.0	0X	0.6133	2.0442			
Bi											

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) The process "Blank" has not been subtracted from the "Sample & Duplicate" results.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 08/11/92

08/20/92

Table 2-1b: SST Core 35, ICP Core Composite
Acid Digestion - QC Results

Project: SST
Procedure: PNL-ALO-211

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- ACID DIGESTION
***** QC Results *****

Analyzed: 08/11/92
M&TE: WA55672
Page 2 of 2

Samp Log#:		92-06767a3		92-06767a3		92-06767a4		92-06767a4			
Dilution:		1.00		5.00		1.00		5.00			
ug/g Factor:		196.19		5.00		100.00		500.00			
ICP Run #:		1026		1033		1025		1032			
Ave a1&a2	RPD	Spike	Spike	Spike		Spike	Spike	Spike			
ug/g	RPD Flg	Added	Sample	Sample	% Dif	STD	Control	Control	% Dif	% Rec	
		ug/g	ug/g	ug/g		ug/mL	ug/mL	ug/mL			
Ag	N/A	98.08	61.0	61.0	0%	50.0	45.6	42.6	6.6%	91.3%	
Al	5525.8	5.1%	490.39	5592.8	5534.9	1%	250.0	247.3	240.5	2.7%	98.9%
As	117.9	6.5%	392.31	492.6	480.0	3%	200.0	200.5	171.6	14.4%	100.2%
B	142.9	10.5%		108.9	(102.4)	6%					
Ba	42.9	0.9%	98.08	130.8	130.9	0%	50.0	47.8	47.0	1.8%	95.7%
Be	7.6	18.3%	9.81	16.5	16.8	2%	5.0	4.7	4.7	0.8%	93.8%
Ca	17031.1	10.1%	980.77	16055.4	18020.8	12%	500.0	485.8	628.7	29.4%	97.2%
Cd	25.1	11.0%	49.04	69.5	70.8	2%	25.0	23.9	22.3	6.7%	95.7%
Ce	77.0	18.6%		78.9	<DL						
Co	67.8	9.4%		(74.1)	<DL						
Cr	216.5	4.4%	98.08	305.0	304.0	0%	50.0	52.0	49.7	4.4%	104.0%
Cu	9.0	13.2%		8.7	<DL						
Dy	N/A		<DL	<DL							
Fe	19457.1	1.5%	98.08	18366.1	18721.4	2%	50.0	40.3	58.6	45.5%	80.5%
K	645.1	0.3%	1961.55	2493.4	2403.4	4%	1000.0	970.8	917.6	5.5%	97.1%
La	17.5	1.9%		17.2	(13.7)	20%					
Li	7.7	4.0%		7.3	(8.2)	13%					
Mg	541.2	2.8%		515.0	526.0	2%					
Mn	145.0	3.2%	19.62	160.5	161.8	1%	10.0	10.1	10.2	1.1%	100.9%
Mo	37.4	0.4%		38.3	(36.4)	5%					
Na	102796.3	0.1%	1961.55	105450.3	105522.9	0%	1000.0	950.4	1050.3	10.5%	95.0%
Nd	59.2	9.8%		58.8	(72.4)	23%					
Ni	10565.6	17.9%	98.08	9300.6	9596.6	3%	50.0	48.1	46.5	3.3%	96.2%
Pb	876.3	8.3%	980.77	1652.5	1690.5	2%	500.0	464.3	445.6	4.0%	92.9%
Re	5.7	38.5%		(5.1)	<DL						
Rh	N/A		<DL	<DL							
Ru	50.7	19.5%		54.3	<DL						
Sb	182.9	12.1%		194.8	204.8	5%					
Se	52.6	33.5%	980.77	623.2	591.5	5%	500.0	326.5	323.1	1.0%	65.3%
Si	842.9	9.4%	980.77	1428.9	953.6	33%	500.0	642.4	513.3	20.1%	128.5%
Sr	321.7	17.4%		333.2	335.1	1%					
Te	N/A		<DL	<DL							
Th	94.7	6.1%		92.6	<DL						
Ti	25.5	7.9%		26.3	23.8	10%					
Tl	311.7	3.3%		(290.4)	(802.3)	176%					
U	83887.4	18.1%	1961.55	86939.4	86322.3	1%	1000.0	933.2	795.7	14.7%	93.3%
V	10.3	3.0%	98.08	103.4	104.3	1%	50.0	50.3	48.7	3.2%	100.6%
Zn	198.8	7.3%		184.5	192.7	4%					
Zr	29.9	11.5%	98.08	87.4	84.8	3%	50.0	48.0	45.6	5.0%	96.0%
P	30839.0	6.2%		30386.4	30119.9	1%					
Bi	N/A		980.77				500.0				

Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
3) The process "Blank" has been subtracted from the "Spike + Sample" and "Spike Control" results.
4) Spike Flag (#): Spike is less than 25% of sample concentration; %recovery for information only.
5) RPD flag (*): RPD > 20% and both sample and duplicate results > QL.

08/20/92

2-5
224

Table 2-1c: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 1C
Top Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PML-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 06/24/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6757A	92-6757B	92-6769			92-6757A			92-6757B			20%
Dilution:	1.00	1.00	1.00			***Estimated***			Average			RPD Flg
ug/g Factor	162.0	181.8	171.3			DL			QL			
ICP Run #	893	894	892			(ug/mL)			(ug/mL)			
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	2Dif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0078	0.0261	N/A			
Al	10519.9	10423.3		<DL	<DL		0.1829	0.6096	10471.6	0.9%		
As J	(36.7)	73.2		<DL	<DL		0.1014	0.3379	54.9	66.4%		
B J	<DL	56.7		69.9	<DL		0.0596	0.1987	N/A			
Ba	55.1	57.4		(1.5)	<DL		0.0080	0.0267	56.3	4.1%		
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0032	0.0107	N/A			
Ca J	OvrRng	OvrRng		234.2	<DL		0.0016	0.0054	N/A			
Cd	9.7	9.5		<DL	<DL		0.0075	0.0250	9.6	1.6%		
Ce	(52.3)	(42.8)		<DL	<DL		0.1019	0.3396	47.5	20.2%		
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1865	0.6217	N/A			
Cr	212.0	219.0		8.1	<DL		0.0113	0.0378	215.5	3.3%		
Cu	13.8	14.1		<DL	<DL		0.0088	0.0294	13.9	2.0%		
Dy	(1.2)	(1.0)		<DL	<DL		0.0053	0.0176	1.1	18.3%		
Fe J	24342.9	19250.7		45.3	<DL		0.0100	0.0334	21796.8	23.4% *		
K	506.8	473.6		<DL	<DL		0.3173	1.0576	490.2	6.8%		
La	32.0	31.7		<DL	<DL		0.0124	0.0414	31.8	0.9%		
Li	4.3	(3.8)		<DL	<DL		0.0074	0.0246	4.0	10.1%		
Mg	475.5	484.6		50.3	<DL		0.0003	0.0009	480.1	1.9%		
Mn	153.7	156.4		1.4	<DL		0.0010	0.0034	155.0	1.8%		
Mo	25.9	25.3		<DL	<DL		0.0128	0.0427	25.6	2.4%		
Na	74657.4	75027.3		179.9	<DL		0.0587	0.1957	74842.4	0.5%		
Nd	93.0	89.4		<DL	<DL		0.0496	0.1653	91.2	4.0%		
Ni	18370.5	18404.4		<DL	<DL		0.0231	0.0768	18387.5	0.2%		
Pb	2196.2	2168.2		<DL	<DL		0.0831	0.2771	2182.2	1.3%		
Re	10.7	12.2		<DL	<DL		0.0173	0.0576	11.5	13.8%		
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0821	0.2738	N/A			
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0350	0.1167	N/A			
Sb	26.5	(22.0)		<DL	<DL		0.0475	0.1584	24.3	18.5%		
Se J	(50.5)	(39.0)		<DL	<DL		0.1515	0.5050	44.8	25.8%		
Si	632.7	678.0		81.6	<DL		0.0549	0.1830	655.4	6.9%		
Sr	152.9	151.0		1.0	<DL		0.0004	0.0013	151.9	1.3%		
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0950	0.3168	N/A			
Th	59.3	52.1		<DL	<DL		0.0734	0.2448	55.7	12.8%		
Ti	45.4	51.7		(2.0)	<DL		0.0054	0.0179	48.6	13.1%		
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.5492	1.8308	N/A			
U	4519.0	4497.9		<DL	<DL		0.5376	1.7920	4508.5	0.5%		
V	12.8	12.7		<DL	<DL		0.0090	0.0301	12.7	0.4%		
Zn	328.5	324.1		(2.0)	<DL		0.0041	0.0136	326.3	1.3%		
Zr	14.6	14.8		<DL	<DL		0.0076	0.0253	14.7	1.2%		
P	18505.3	18560.5		<DL	<DL		0.6133	2.0442	18532.9	0.3%		
Bi									N/A			

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/24/92

06/25/92

2-6-25

Table 2-1d: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 1C
Bottom Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 06/24/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6758A J	92-67588	92-6769	92-6758A		92-67588		20%	
Dilution:	1.00	1.00	1.00	***Estimated***	DL	QL	Average	RPD	Flg
ug/g Factor	200.2	182.8	191.1	DL	QL	DL	QL		
ICP Run #	896	897	892	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)		
Ag	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A			
Al	11612.6	10400.8	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	11006.7	11.0%		
As	(67.6)	66.5	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	67.1	1.5%		
B J	90.5	67.0	78.0	0.0596	0.1987	78.8	29.8% *		
Ba	58.0	53.7	(1.6)	0.0080	0.0267	55.8	7.7%		
Be	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	N/A			
Ca J	<DL	<DL	261.2	0.0016	0.0054	N/A			
Cd	10.5	9.3	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	9.9	13.0%		
Ce	(46.4)	(44.1)	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	45.2	5.0%		
Co	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	N/A			
Cr	211.1	213.3	9.0	0.0113	0.0378	212.2	1.1%		
Cu J	20.0	14.4	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	17.2	32.6% *		
Dy	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	N/A			
Fe J	27042.8	19226.5	50.5	0.0100	0.0334	23134.7	33.8% *		
K	491.2	474.4	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	482.8	3.5%		
La	33.4	32.1	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	32.8	4.1%		
Li	(3.6)	(3.8)	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	3.7	6.0%		
Mg	494.9	482.5	56.1	0.0003	0.0009	488.7	2.5%		
Mn	173.6	142.5	1.6	0.0010	0.0034	158.0	19.7%		
Mo	25.6	24.4	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	25.0	4.7%		
Na	73044.7	71706.4	200.7	0.0587	0.1957	72375.5	1.8%		
Nd	89.8	89.2	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	89.5	0.6%		
Ni	17504.6	18540.1	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	18022.3	5.7%		
Pb	2356.0	2134.8	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	2245.4	9.8%		
Re	(11.2)	11.7	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	11.5	4.4%		
Rh	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	N/A			
Ru	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	N/A			
Sb J	(28.2)	(21.6)	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	24.9	26.5%		
Se	(50.6)	(45.5)	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	48.0	10.5%		
Si	640.4	585.6	91.0	0.0549	0.1830	613.0	8.9%		
Sr	149.1	152.0	1.1	0.0004	0.0013	150.6	1.9%		
Te	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	N/A			
Th	54.5	50.9	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	52.7	6.8%		
Ti	41.9	38.3	(2.2)	0.0054	0.0179	40.1	8.9%		
Tl	<DL	<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	N/A			
U	4275.8	4449.3	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	4362.5	4.0%		
V	13.6	12.2	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	12.9	11.2%		
Zn	355.1	313.3	(2.2)	0.0041	0.0136	334.2	12.5%		
Zr	19.5	<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	N/A			
P	17331.7	18109.3	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	17720.5	4.4%		
Bi						N/A			

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/24/92

06/25/92

Table 2-1e: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 2D
Top Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

PROJECT: PNL-ALO-211
PROCEDURE: WA55672

Date Analyzed: 06/24/92
M&TE:

Samp Log#:	92-6759A J	92-67598	92-6770							92-6759A		
Dilution:	1.00	1.00	1.00									
ug/g Factor	214.8	166.9	187.8									
ICP Run #	902	903	901									
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	20%	
											RPD	Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL	<DL					0.0078	0.0261	N/A		
Al	2781.6	2825.9	<DL					0.1829	0.6096	2803.8	1.6%	
As	82.7	96.5	<DL					0.1014	0.3379	89.6	15.4%	
B J	68.1	90.9	80.8					0.0596	0.1987	79.5	28.7%	*
Ba	33.9	34.1	<DL					0.0080	0.0267	34.0	0.6%	
Be	5.0	5.1	<DL					0.0032	0.0107	5.0	3.3%	
Ca	2122.8	2071.2	274.0					0.0016	0.0054	2097.0	2.5%	
Cd	19.4	20.2	<DL					0.0075	0.0250	19.8	4.0%	
Ce	(70.2)	77.9	<DL					0.1019	0.3396	74.0	10.3%	
Co	(51.1)	(60.9)	<DL					0.1865	0.6217	56.0	17.5%	
Cr	185.8	188.5	(2.2)					0.0113	0.0378	187.2	1.4%	
Cu J	9.9	14.0	(2.1)					0.0088	0.0294	12.0	33.8%	*
Dy	<DL	<DL	<DL					0.0053	0.0176	N/A		
Fe	29670.9	30209.7	26.0					0.0100	0.0334	29940.3	1.8%	
K	447.2	466.5	<DL					0.3173	1.0576	456.8	4.2%	
La	11.2	11.6	<DL					0.0124	0.0414	11.4	3.6%	
Li	5.8	5.8	<DL					0.0074	0.0246	5.8	0.5%	
Mg	493.0	486.9	55.5					0.0003	0.0009	489.9	1.2%	
Mn	190.6	193.0	(0.5)					0.0010	0.0034	191.8	1.3%	
Mo	26.8	27.6	<DL					0.0128	0.0427	27.2	3.0%	
Na	95604.7	97629.4	176.8					0.0587	0.1957	96617.1	2.1%	
Nd	36.0	36.6	<DL					0.0496	0.1653	36.3	1.5%	
Ni	751.2	768.7	<DL					0.0231	0.0768	760.0	2.3%	
Pb	965.9	962.8	<DL					0.0831	0.2771	964.4	0.3%	
Re	<DL	<DL	<DL					0.0173	0.0576	N/A		
Rh	<DL	<DL	<DL					0.0821	0.2738	N/A		
Ru J	(17.8)	22.7	<DL					0.0350	0.1167	20.2	24.1%	
Sb	136.9	137.3	<DL					0.0475	0.1584	137.1	0.2%	
Se	<DL	(42.8)	<DL					0.1515	0.5050	N/A		
Si	1112.7	1176.3	92.0					0.0549	0.1830	1144.5	5.6%	
Sr	606.5	629.3	1.1					0.0004	0.0013	617.9	3.7%	
Te	<DL	<DL	<DL					0.0950	0.3168	N/A		
Th	(17.1)	(21.0)	<DL					0.0734	0.2448	19.1	20.1%	
Ti	20.6	21.2	(1.6)					0.0054	0.0179	20.9	2.7%	
Tl J	(308.2)	(177.7)	<DL					0.5492	1.8308	242.9	53.7%	
U	56633.0	57462.1	<DL					0.5376	1.7920	57047.6	1.5%	
V	8.0	8.5	<DL					0.0090	0.0301	8.3	6.2%	
Zn	188.7	196.0	3.2					0.0041	0.0136	192.4	3.8%	
Zr	18.4	16.5	<DL					0.0076	0.0253	17.5	10.7%	
P	28234.4	28989.4	<DL					0.6133	2.0442	28611.9	2.6%	
Bi										N/A		

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/24/92

06/25/92

Table 2-1f: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 2D
Bottom Acid Digestion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Acid Digestion

Date Analyzed: 06/24/92
M&TE:

PROJECT: PNL-ALO-211
PROCEDURE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6760A J	92-6760B	92-6770							92-6760A		
Dilution:	1.00	1.00	1.00							92-6760B		
ug/g Factor	202.0	205.3	203.6							Average		
ICP Run #	905	906	901							DL	QL	20X
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	XDif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	XDif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	(ug/g)	RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261	N/A	
Al	3307.0	3666.9		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096	3487.0	10.3%
As	713.3	765.1		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379	739.2	7.0%
B J	139.2	120.5		87.6	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987	129.9	14.4%
Ba	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267	N/A	
Be	5.0	5.5		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107	5.2	10.1%
Ca	2510.2	2743.2		297.5	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0016	0.0054	2626.7	8.9%
Cd	20.0	22.3		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250	21.2	10.9%
Ce	440.6	475.1		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396	457.8	7.5%
Co	306.3	338.4		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217	322.3	10.0%
Cr	374.0	409.7		(2.4)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378	391.8	9.1%
Cu	102.2	116.4		(2.2)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0088	0.0294	109.3	13.0%
Dy	38.0	42.0		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176	40.0	10.1%
Fe	29655.7	32875.4		28.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0100	0.0334	31265.6	10.3%
K	466.7	478.2		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.3173	1.0576	472.5	2.4%
La	61.5	68.6		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414	65.1	10.9%
Li	5.9	6.1		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246	6.0	3.3%
Mg	503.9	551.9		60.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0003	0.0009	527.9	9.1%
Mn	189.0	207.1		(0.5)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0010	0.0034	198.0	9.1%
Mo	27.1	29.4		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427	28.3	8.3%
Na	93803.1	99336.0		191.7	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0587	0.1957	96569.5	5.7%
Nd	229.2	250.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653	239.9	8.9%
Ni	776.5	854.0		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0231	0.0768	815.3	9.5%
Pb	1236.8	1337.4		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771	1287.1	7.8%
Re	34.2	37.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576	35.9	9.8%
Rh	324.0	358.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738	341.3	10.2%
Ru	386.1	426.3		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167	406.2	9.9%
Sb	132.9	158.1		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584	145.5	17.3%
Se	662.6	733.9		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050	698.2	10.2%
Si	1679.4	1903.6		99.6	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0549	0.1830	1791.5	12.5%
Sr	614.8	713.0		1.2	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0004	0.0013	663.9	14.8%
Te	111.2	122.8		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168	117.0	9.9%
Th	1392.0	1540.1		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448	1466.1	10.1%
Ti	37.3	40.6		(1.8)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0054	0.0179	38.9	8.6%
Tl	2907.3	3150.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308	3029.0	8.0%
U	55873.4	61866.8		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920	58870.1	10.2%
V	75.6	83.7		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301	79.7	10.1%
Zn	191.4	212.8		3.4	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0041	0.0136	202.1	10.6%
Zr	49.4	53.1		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253	51.2	7.2%
P	28721.0	31131.0		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442	29926.0	8.1%
Bi											N/A	

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) 20X *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 06/24/92

06/25/92

Table 2-2a: SST Core 36, ICP Core Composite Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/NI Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 08/10/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:		92-6767H1	92-6767H2			92-6767H4				
Dilution:		1.00	1.00			1.00				
ug/g Factor		2248.6	2212.6			2230.4			***Estimated***	
ICP Run #		1010	1011			1009			DL	QL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)
Ag	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0078	0.0261
Al	6356.2	6464.0	1.7%				<DL		0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1014	0.3379
B	<DL	(140.3)					<DL		0.0596	0.1987
Ba	77.3	76.5	1.0%				(25.3)		0.0080	0.0267
Be	(9.7)	(8.6)	11.4%				<DL		0.0032	0.0107
Ca	20155.0	20626.1	2.3%				269.2		0.0016	0.0054
Cd	(23.6)	(22.8)	3.5%				<DL		0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1865	0.6217
Cr	253.0	261.1	3.2%				<DL		0.0113	0.0378
Cu	(54.9)	(45.3)	19.2%				(23.7)		0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0053	0.0176
Fe	28011.1	26012.0	15.4%				98.7		0.0100	0.0334
K	N/A	N/A					N/A		0.3173	1.0576
La	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0074	0.0246
Mg	613.9	606.5	1.2%				31.6		0.0003	0.0009
Mn	254.3	277.2	8.6%				92.8		0.0010	0.0034
Mo	(43.4)	(44.7)	2.9%				<DL		0.0128	0.0427
Na	118783.6	122676.1	3.2%				719.1		0.0587	0.1957
Nd	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0496	0.1653
Ni	N/A	N/A					N/A		0.0231	0.0768
Pb	1150.8	947.3	19.4%				<DL		0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0350	0.1167
Sb	(247.5)	(222.6)	10.6%				<DL		0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.1515	0.5050
Si	1950.3	1911.1	2.0%				(311.8)		0.0549	0.1830
Sr	396.9	394.5	0.6%				(0.9)		0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0734	0.2448
Ti	79.8	81.5	2.1%				<DL		0.0054	0.0179
Tl	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.5492	1.8308
U	107041.5	102778.5	4.1%				<DL		0.5376	1.7920
V	<DL	<DL					<DL		0.0090	0.0301
Zn	328.7	296.7	10.2%				42.6		0.0041	0.0136
Zr	(36.7)	(30.6)	18.0%				<DL		0.0076	0.0253
P	36604.2	36917.1	0.9%				<DL		0.6133	2.0442
Bi										

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% "RPD" flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > DL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 08/10/92

08/20/92

Table 2-2b: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 1C and 1D Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Ni Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 07/21/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6761A1	92-6761A2		92-6762A1	92-6762A2		92-6761A5	92-6761A5		
Dilution:	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		
ug/g Factor	4974.9	4196.7		4168.1	4669.1		4477.3	4477.3	***Estimated***	
ICP Run #	962	963		964	965		961	968	DL	QL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20X RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20X RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261
Al	13562.5	49776.2	114.3% *	4013.0	3898.0	2.9%	<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379
B	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987
Ba	(115.8)	134.3	14.8%	(70.5)	(70.8)	0.4%	(37.8)	(37.5)	0.0080	0.0267
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107
Ca	27396.7	17379.3	44.7% *	28896.5	28245.6	2.3%	546.4	556.7	0.0016	0.0054
Cd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217
Cr	225.3	(154.2)	37.5%	211.0	282.5	28.9% *	<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378
Cu	(72.3)	(78.2)	7.9%	<DL	(71.0)		(51.5)	(56.9)	0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176
Fe	32309.0	56783.6	54.9% *	7363.5	7656.1	3.9%	167.9	172.7	0.0100	0.0334
K	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.3173	1.0576
La	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246
Mg	634.0	514.5	20.8% *	403.0	400.8	0.5%	55.5	56.9	0.0003	0.0009
Mn	277.1	408.3	38.3% *	91.3	135.4	38.9% *	34.9	34.5	0.0010	0.0034
Mo	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427
Na	68898.1	42587.8	47.2% *	82798.7	80602.5	2.7%	1172.4	1203.3	0.0587	0.1957
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653
Ni	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.0231	0.0768
Pb	2780.0	3043.1	9.0%	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167
Sb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050
Si	4703.0	3013.4	43.8% *	893.9	(666.4)	29.2%	(352.4)	(309.7)	0.0549	0.1830
Sr	160.5	128.4	22.3% *	119.0	115.6	2.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448
Ti	222.3	151.7	37.8% *	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0054	0.0179
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308
U	(2845.4)	<DL		(3495.5)	(2722.3)	24.9%	<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301
Zn	538.5	632.6	16.1%	199.0	231.4	15.0%	99.2	103.2	0.0041	0.0136
Zr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253
P	17587.6	10932.3	46.7% *	19479.6	19154.9	1.7%	<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442
Bi										

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20X *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 07/21/92

07/27/92

Table 2-2c: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 2A Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/WI Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 07/21/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6763A1	92-6763A2					92-6761A5	92-6761A5		
Dilution:	1.00	1.00					1.00	1.00		
ug/g Factor	4418.1	4628.8					4521.0	4521.0	***Estimated***	
ICP Run #	966	967					961	968	DL	DL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)
Ag	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261
Al	2998.9	2857.4	4.8%				<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379
B	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987
Ba	(72.5)	(74.6)	2.9%				(38.2)	(37.8)	0.0080	0.0267
Be	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107
Ca	22411.3	20289.3	9.9%				551.8	562.1	0.0016	0.0054
Cd	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217
Cr	197.4	190.9	3.4%				<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378
Cu	370.9	<DL					(52.0)	(57.5)	0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176
Fe	11750.4	10847.1	8.0%				169.6	174.4	0.0100	0.0334
K	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.3173	1.0576
La	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246
Mg	505.7	457.6	10.0%				56.0	57.4	0.0003	0.0009
Mn	109.1	98.6	10.1%				35.3	34.8	0.0010	0.0034
Mo	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427
Na	91675.0	91998.5	0.4%				1183.8	1215.0	0.0587	0.1957
Nd	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653
Ni	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.0231	0.0768
Pb	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167
Sb	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050
Si	1338.7	1371.8	2.4%				(355.9)	(312.7)	0.0549	0.1830
Sr	236.7	218.3	8.1%				<DL	<DL	0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448
Ti	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0054	0.0179
Tl	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308
U	41400.1	38267.3	7.9%				<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920
V	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301
Zn	979.7	172.0	140.3% *				100.1	104.2	0.0041	0.0136
Zr	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253
P	22299.6	20053.4	10.6%				<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442
Bi										

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > DL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 07/21/92

07/27/92

WHC-EP-0640 Rev. 1
WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 36

Table 2-2d: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 2B and 2C Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Ni Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 08/05/92
M&E: WASS672

Samp Log#:	92-6764A1	92-6764A2		J 92-6765A1	92-6765A2		92-6764A5	92-6764A5	
Dilution:	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
ug/g Factor	2374.2	2024.5		1881.3	2029.8		2062.5	2062.5	***Estimated***
ICP Run #	997	998		999	1000		996	1003	DL QL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL) (ug/mL)
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0078 0.0261
Al	3040.4	3087.6	1.5%	2110.6	2039.3	3.4%	<DL	<DL	0.1829 0.6096
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1014 0.3379
B	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0596 0.1987
Ba J	251.3	(26.0)	162.5%	(32.9)	(31.6)	4.2%	<DL	<DL	0.0080 0.0267
Be	(15.2)	(16.0)	5.1%	(10.2)	(9.5)	6.3%	<DL	<DL	0.0032 0.0107
Cd	8709.9	9113.0	4.5%	3000.7	3020.1	0.6%	113.9	118.4	0.0016 0.0054
Ce	(34.9)	(41.1)	16.3%	(26.7)	(24.0)	10.9%	<DL	<DL	0.0075 0.0250
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1019 0.3396
Cr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1865 0.6217
Cu J	155.1	178.7	14.2%	160.7	152.0	5.6%	<DL	<DL	0.0113 0.0378
Dy	78.2	(27.2)	96.7%	(20.9)	(22.3)	6.7%	(29.2)	(27.6)	0.0088 0.0294
Fe	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0053 0.0176
K	8880.5	8940.0	0.7%	15654.6	14605.0	6.9%	130.6	130.6	0.0100 0.0334
La	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.3173 1.0576
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0124 0.0414
Mg	<DL	(18.0)		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0074 0.0246
Mn	288.0	279.2	3.1%	259.2	295.3	13.0%	17.6	18.3	0.0003 0.0009
Mo	160.0	135.4	16.6%	276.4	236.1	15.7%	75.3	76.7	0.0010 0.0034
Nd	(44.9)	(39.1)	13.8%	(34.6)	(34.1)	1.5%	<DL	<DL	0.0128 0.0427
Ni	90050.9	91137.9	1.2%	105514.6	105888.5	0.4%	(280.3)	(266.1)	0.0587 0.1957
Pb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0496 0.1653
Pd	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.0231 0.0768
Pb	<DL	<DL		(340.7)	(359.9)	5.5%	<DL	<DL	0.0831 0.2771
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0173 0.0576
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0821 0.2738
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0350 0.1167
Sb	405.9	424.5	4.5%	(288.9)	(282.2)	2.4%	<DL	<DL	0.0475 0.1584
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.1515 0.5050
Si	1324.7	1233.5	7.1%	880.2	842.3	4.4%	<DL	<DL	0.0549 0.1830
Sr	168.6	168.0	0.4%	319.6	298.8	6.7%	<DL	<DL	0.0004 0.0013
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0950 0.3168
Th J	(226.4)	(169.9)	28.5%	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0734 0.2448
Ti J	(27.3)	(35.8)	26.7%	J 42.8	(34.5)	21.3%	<DL	<DL	0.0054 0.0179
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.5492 1.8308
U	171775.5	177587.0	3.3%	115925.7	108452.1	6.7%	<DL	<DL	0.5376 1.7920
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0090 0.0301
Zn	120.4	103.5	15.1%	117.4	122.2	4.0%	(25.8)	(28.1)	0.0041 0.0136
Zr J	(31.6)	(15.7)	67.2%	(20.0)	<DL		<DL	<DL	0.0076 0.0253
P	24748.0	25720.5	3.9%	34516.6	32602.4	5.7%	<DL	<DL	0.6133 2.0442
Bi									

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 08/05/92

08/20/92

Table 2-2e: SST Core 36, ICP Quarter Segment 2D Fusion

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- KOH/Mi Fusions

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211Analyzed Date: 08/05/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6766A1	92-6766A2					92-6764A5	92-6764A5		
Dilution:	1.00	1.00					1.00	1.00		
ug/g Factor	2084.9	1911.8					1994.6	1994.6	***Estimated***	
ICP Run #	1001	1002					996	1003	DL	QL
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20% RPD Flag	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)
Ag	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0078	0.0261
Al	2944.2	3023.4	2.7%				<DL	<DL	0.1829	0.6096
As	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1014	0.3379
B	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0596	0.1987
Ba	(39.4)	(37.0)	6.3%				<DL	<DL	0.0080	0.0267
Be	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0032	0.0107
Ca	2122.7	2134.1	0.5%				110.1	114.5	0.0016	0.0054
Cd	(16.7)	(14.7)	12.5%				<DL	<DL	0.0075	0.0250
Ce	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1019	0.3396
Co	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1865	0.6217
Cr	210.2	212.3	1.0%				<DL	<DL	0.0113	0.0378
Cu	90.9	(29.7)	101.4%				(28.2)	(26.7)	0.0088	0.0294
Dy	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0053	0.0176
Fe	30859.2	31572.1	2.3%				126.3	126.3	0.0100	0.0334
K	N/A	N/A					N/A	N/A	0.3173	1.0576
La	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0124	0.0414
Li	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0074	0.0246
Mg	398.4	452.3	12.7%				17.1	17.7	0.0003	0.0009
Mn	292.3	239.4	19.9%				72.8	74.2	0.0010	0.0034
Mo	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0128	0.0427
Na	104334.6	105941.8	1.5%				(271.1)	(257.3)	0.0587	0.1957
Nd	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0496	0.1653
Ni	N/A	N/A					N/A	N/A	0.0231	0.0768
Pb	771.0	816.8	5.8%				<DL	<DL	0.0831	0.2771
Re	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0173	0.0576
Rh	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0821	0.2738
Ru	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0350	0.1167
Sb	(153.2)	(156.5)	2.1%				<DL	<DL	0.0475	0.1584
Se	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.1515	0.5050
Si	1402.8	1400.4	0.2%				<DL	<DL	0.0549	0.1830
Sr	609.6	625.9	2.6%				<DL	<DL	0.0004	0.0013
Te	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0950	0.3168
Th	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0734	0.2448
Ti	(34.1)	(26.3)	25.8%				<DL	<DL	0.0054	0.0179
Tl	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.5492	1.8308
U	57961.1	59671.6	2.9%				<DL	<DL	0.5376	1.7920
V	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0090	0.0301
Zn	248.1	222.9	10.7%				(24.9)	(27.1)	0.0041	0.0136
Zr	<DL	<DL					<DL	<DL	0.0076	0.0253
P	29587.3	30127.2	1.8%				<DL	<DL	0.6133	2.0442
Bi										

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
 2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
 3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
 4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
 5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
 6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
 7) 20% "RPD" flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > DL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 08/05/92

08/20/92

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 36

Table 2-3: SST Core 36, ICP Core Composite Water Leach

ICP ANALYSIS REPORT -- Water Leach

PROJECT: SST
PROCEDURE: PNL-ALO-211

Analyzed Date: 08/12/92
M&TE: WA55672

Samp Log#:	92-6767C1	92-6767C2	92-6740C5	***Estimated***		92-6767C1	92-6767C2		
Dilution:	2.00	2.00	2.00	DL	QL	Average			
ug/g Factor	194.8	198.5	202.4						
ICP Run #	1042	1043	1041						
	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	XDif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	XDif	(ug/g)	(ug/g)	20%
							(ug/mL)	(ug/mL)	RPD Flg
Ag	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0078	0.0261	N/A
Al	988.6	639.6		<DL	<DL		0.1829	0.6096	814.1 42.9% *
As	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1014	0.3379	N/A
B	(36.9)	(22.4)		<DL	<DL		0.0596	0.1987	29.7 49.0%
Ba	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0080	0.0267	N/A
Be	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0032	0.0107	N/A
Ca	194.1	576.6		9.9	<DL		0.0016	0.0054	385.4 99.2% *
Cd	(1.9)	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0075	0.0250	N/A
Ce	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1019	0.3396	N/A
Co	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1865	0.6217	N/A
Cr	224.8	147.0		<DL	<DL		0.0113	0.0378	185.9 41.9% *
Cu	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0088	0.0294	N/A
Dy	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0053	0.0176	N/A
Fe	1451.6	1336.0		<DL	<DL		0.0100	0.0334	1393.8 8.3%
K	620.8	385.0		<DL	<DL		0.3173	1.0576	502.9 46.9% *
La	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0124	0.0414	N/A
Li	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0074	0.0246	N/A
Mg	44.3	13.1		1.0	<DL		0.0003	0.0009	28.7 108.8% *
Mn	2.2	4.0		<DL	<DL		0.0010	0.0034	3.1 59.9% *
Mo	33.1	22.3		<DL	<DL		0.0128	0.0427	27.7 39.2% *
Na	130962.1	85753.0		<DL	<DL		0.0587	0.1957	108357.6 41.7% *
Nd	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0496	0.1653	N/A
Ni	827.4	756.1		<DL	<DL		0.0231	0.0768	791.8 9.0%
Pb	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0831	0.2771	N/A
Re	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0173	0.0576	N/A
Rh	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0821	0.2738	N/A
Ru	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0350	0.1167	N/A
Sb	(19.9)	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0475	0.1584	N/A
Se	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.1515	0.5050	N/A
Si	99.6	39.9		<DL	<DL		0.0549	0.1830	69.8 85.5% *
Sn	2.2	9.7		<DL	<DL		0.0004	0.0013	6.0 124.6% *
Te	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0950	0.3168	N/A
Th	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0734	0.2448	N/A
Ti	<DL	(1.6)		<DL	<DL		0.0054	0.0179	N/A
Tl	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.5492	1.8308	N/A
U	6207.4	2985.6		<DL	<DL		0.5376	1.7920	4596.5 70.1% *
V	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0090	0.0301	N/A
Zn	4.3	7.3		<DL	<DL		0.0041	0.0136	5.8 50.8% *
Zr	<DL	<DL		<DL	<DL		0.0076	0.0253	N/A
P	19807.2	13093.4		<DL	<DL		0.6133	2.0442	16450.3 40.8% *
Bi									N/A

- Note: 1) Values reliable to 2 1/2 significant digits. Bracketed results () are qualitative.
2) Blank is reported in ug/g "equivalence" to indicate blank effect on sample.
3) Sample results have not been adjusted for "blank" contribution.
4) At 50-100 times the D.L., precision is estimated at +/-10% and accuracy at +/-15%.
5) Sample DL (ug/g) = (DL in ug/mL) * (ug/g Factor)
6) Off-line IEC: Results within 50X DL potentially bias high.
7) 20% *** flag: RPD > 20% and both sample results > QL.

Data, including calibration/QC, archived File ICP-325-601- 08/12/92

08/20/92

Table 2-4a: SST Core 36, IC Fluoride

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

FLUORIDE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		600							
92-06761-B J	500	400	22%	600	270	37%	230	92%	30
92-06762-B	500	500	0%						
92-06763-B	500	500	0%						
92-06764-B	400	400	0%						
92-06765-B	400	400	0%						
92-06766-B	1100	1200	9%						
92-06767-C J	500	400	22%	700	250	80%	200	80%	< 80
92-06774-C	300	300	0%						
92-08169-B	300	300	0%	400	250	40%	210	84%	< 60

TRUE = 250 ug/mL

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4b: SST Core 36, IC Chloride

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

CHLORIDE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		1200							
92-06761-B	900	900	0%	1200	270	111%	240	96%	< 30
92-06762-B	900	1000	11%						
92-06763-B	900	900	0%						
92-06764-B	600	600	0%						
92-06765-B	700	600	15%						
92-06766-B	700	700	0%						
92-06767-C J	1200	900	29%	1100	250	-40%	230	92%	< 80
92-06774-C	900	900	0%						
92-08169-B	800	700	13%	1000	250	80%	330	132%	< 60
							TRUE= 250 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

Table 2-4c: SST Core 36, IC Nitrite

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

NITRITE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		65000							
92-06761-B	50000	46000	8%	63000	16200	80%	13700	91%	< 50
92-06762-B	49000	53000	8%						
92-06763-B	48000	49000	2%						
92-06764-B	31000	29000	7%						
92-06765-B	33000	31000	6%						
92-06766-B	35000	35000	0%						
92-06767-C J	64000	41000	44%	55000	14900	-60%	12800	85%	< 200
92-06774-C	46000	46000	0%						
92-08169-B	34000	35000	3%	49000	15000	100%	12500	83%	< 100
							TRUE= 15000 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

Table 2-4d: SST Core 36, IC Nitrate

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

NITRATE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		82000							
92-06761-B	64000	60000	6%	86000	21600	102%	21300	107%	< 50
92-06762-B	64000	69000	8%						
92-06763-B	66000	66000	0%						
92-06764-B	43000	42000	2%						
92-06765-B	48000	44000	9%						
92-06766-B	51000	51000	0%						
92-06767-C J	87000	56000	43%	78000	19900	-45%	21100	106%	< 200
92-06774-C	58000	59000	2%						
92-08169-B	43000	44000	2%	70000	19900	136%	22300	112%	< 100
							TRUE= 20000 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

WMC-EP-0640 Rev. 1
 WMC-SD-WM-DP-026
 ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
 CORE 36

2-25

C44

APP D-69

Table 2-4e: SST Core 36, IC Phosphate

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

PHOSPHATE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		19200							
92-06761-B	17700	15500	13%	21000	3770	88%	3480	99%	< 50
92-06762-B	16600	19000	13%						
92-06763-B	23300	22400	4%						
92-06764-B	20400	20400	0%						
92-06765-B	38000	43000	12%						
92-06766-B	54000	56000	4%						
92-06767-C J	60000	39000	42%	48000	3500	-343%	3400	97%	< 200
92-06774-C	12900	13000	1%						
92-08169-B	18100	17600	3%	22600	3500	129%	3400	97%	< 100
							TRUE= 3500 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

MHC-SD-WM-OP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 36

APP D-70

4.45

2-26

Table 2-4f: SST Core 36, IC Sulfate

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

SULFATE

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		15700							
92-06761-B	12600	11500	9%	16600	4040	99%	3760	100%	< 50
92-06762-B	12500	13500	8%						
92-06763-B	12500	12300	2%						
92-06764-B	8300	7800	6%						
92-06765-B	8900	8300	7%						
92-06766-B	9500	9500	0%						
92-06767-C J	16200	11200	36%	14100	3700	-57%	3600	96%	< 200
92-06774-C	10900	10900	0%						
92-08169-B	8600	8600	0%	13100	3700	122%	3700	99%	< 100
							TRUE= 3750 ug/mL		

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

MHC-EP-0640 Rev. I
 MHC-SD-MM-DP-026
 ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
 CORE 36

Table 2-4g: SST Core 36, IC Free Cyanide

**** ION CHROMATOGRAPHY REPORT ****

free CN

SAMPLE VALUES ARE IN ug/g

TANK 112, CORE 34 TO 36

SAMPLE ID	SMPL	DUP	RPD	<----- SPIKE ----->			SPIKE CNTRL		BLANK
	1	2		3	SPIKE	% REC	4	% REC	5
92-06740-C		1790							
92-06761-B	1150	1020	12%						< 1
92-06762-B	1140	1200	5%						
92-06763-B	1220	1130	8%						
92-06764-B	730	740	1%						
92-06765-B	860	780	10%						
92-06766-B	880	920	4%						
92-06767-C J	1590	1040	42%						< 2
92-06774-C	1030	1020	1%						
92-08169-B	770	790	3%						< 1

THERE ARE NO SPIKES OR SPIKE CONTROLS FOR THIS SET OF DATA.

NOTES:

1. THIS DATA SUMMARY SHEET INFORMATION IS NOT COMPLETE WITHOUT THE RUN NARRATIVE.
2. Nomenclature used for this data set: 1: Sample; 2: Duplicate; 3: Sample spike; 4: Spike Control; 5: Blank.
3. Sample detection limits are computed using nominal detection limits of 0.25 and 0.5 ug/mL in undiluted extracts.
4. Calculate sample values: analyte in sample extract x (sample wt. + diluent wt.)/ sample wt.
5. Calculate spike recovery: (spiked sample - sample)/spike.
6. Calculate spike control recovery: (spike control) / true value for analyte in stock spike.
7. 92-06740 - CORE 34; 92-06761 to 92-06767 - CORE 36; 92-06774 & 92-08169 - CORE 35.

SAMPLES ANALYZED AT BATTELLE-PNL, ACL-INORGANIC IC LAB, ROOM 400, 325 BLDG.

WHC-SD-WM-DP-026
ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
CORE 36

Table 2-5: SST Core 36, GFAA, Hg, Cr(VI) and NH₃-N Inorganic ResultsGFAA: Acid Digestion -- Core Composite

Arsenic	92-06767-B1 sample	<0.9	µg/g	
	-B2 duplicate	<0.9	µg/g	
	-B3 spike	2.8	µg/g	(56% Recovery)
	-B4 control	2.88	µg/ml	(115% Recovery)
	-B5 proc. blk.	<0.9	µg/g	
Selenium	92-06767-B1 sample	<13	µg/g	
	-B2 duplicate	<13	µg/g	
	-B3 spike	(0)	µg/g	(0% Recovery)
	-B4 control	2.56	µg/ml	(102% Recovery)
	-B5 proc. blk.	<13	µg/g	
Antimony	92-06767-A1 sample	<3.6	µg/g	
	-A2 duplicate	<3.6	µg/g	
	-A3 spike	1.8	µg/g	(37% Recovery)
	-A4 control	2.42	µg/ml	(97% Recovery)
	-A5 proc. blk.	<3.6	µg/g	

Note: The As, Se and Sb predigestion spike recoveries do not meet the 75-125% recovery criteria. Therefore, the results for all samples may be biased low.

Mercury: Core Composite

92-06767-D1 sample	5.0	µg/g	
-D2 duplicate	3.8	µg/g	
-D3 spike	(N/A--spike	<<25% sample)	
-D4 control	1.57	µg/L	(79% Recovery)
-D5 proc. blk.	<0.1	µg/g	

Chromium(VI): Water Leach -- Core Composite

92-06767-C1 sample	60	µg/g	
-C2 duplicate	90	µg/g	
-C5 proc. blk.	<30	µg/g	

Ammonia (NH₃-N): Water Leach -- Core Composite

92-06767-C1 sample	<5.0	µg/g	
-C2 duplicate	6.9	µg/g	
-C5 proc. blk.	<5.0	µg/g	

TABLE 3-1a: SST Core 36 Gamma Energy Analysis of Quarter Segments - Homogenization Tests

Sample ID	*	Co(60) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(137) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(154) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(155) uCi/g	+/- % error	Am(241) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(134) uCi/g	+/- % error	Ce(144) uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 36 - Quarter Segment - Homogenization Tests															
92-06757A	A/smp			5.26E+00	4	4.23E-01	3	4.93E-01	5	3.18E-01	9				
92-06757B	A/dup			4.96E+01	4	4.12E-01	3	4.43E-01	6	2.72E-01	11				
92-06758A	A/smp			3.73E+01	4	4.35E-01	3	4.75E-01	6	2.85E-01	11				
92-06758B	A/dup	7.92E-03	24	4.98E+01	4	4.10E-01	3	5.00E-01	5	2.81E-01	10				
92-06769	A/blk	1.60E-03	11	7.03E-02	4	2.01E-03	16	3.18E-03	14	1.51E-03	33	1.28E-03	20	6.85E-03	31
92-06759A	A/smp	1.01E-02	6	1.75E+00	4	3.21E-02	6	4.02E-02	11	2.19E-02	23				
92-06759B	A/dup	5.35E-03	9	1.65E+00	4	3.12E-02	5	3.95E-02	10	2.66E-02	20				
92-06760A	A/smp	7.96E-03	7	1.94E+00	4	3.58E-02	5	4.17E-02	10						
92-06760B	A/dup	4.68E-03	12	2.31E+00	4	3.24E-02	6	4.01E-02	11	2.58E-02	24				
92-06770	A/blk	4.66E-03	7	9.90E-02	4	1.88E-03	20			1.48E-03	28	1.05E-03	18		

* A = acid digestion F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

TABLE 3-1b: SST Core 36 Gamma Energy Analysis of Quarter Segments

Sample ID	*	Co(60) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(137) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(154) uCi/g	+/- % error	Eu(155) uCi/g	+/- % error	Am(241) uCi/g	+/- % error	K(40) uCi/g	+/- % error	Cs(134) uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 36 - Quarter Segments - Fusion Dissolution															
92-06761A1	F/smp	2.86E-02	14	4.92E+02	4	5.04E-01	5	5.03E-01	11	2.92E-01	22				
92-06761A2	F/dup	1.73E-02	20	3.28E+02	4	4.80E-01	4	3.86E-01	12	2.89E-01	19				
92-06761A5	F/blk	1.32E-03	25	5.83E-02	5										
92-06762A1	F/smp			1.25E+03	4					2.73E-01	65				
92-06762A2	F/dup			1.23E+03	4										
92-06763A1	F/smp			9.33E+02	4										
92-06763A2	F/dup			8.35E+02	4										
92-06764A1	F/smp	8.17E-03	20	5.29E+02	4										
92-06764A2	F/dup			5.35E+02	4										
92-06764A5	F/blk			5.52E-03	9										
92-06765A1	F/smp	4.65E-03	19	1.05E+02	4					2.70E-02	46				
92-06765A2	F/dup	1.13E-02	10	9.99E+01	4	3.42E-02	12			4.85E-02	30				
92-06766A1	F/smp	6.60E-03	9	3.46E+01	4	3.19E-02	6	3.53E-02	15						
92-06766A2	F/dup	8.24E-03	7	3.54E+01	4	3.11E-02	7	3.55E-02	14	2.54E-02	23	5.25E-03	62	7.31E-03	23
Core 36 - Quarter Segments - Water Leach															
92-06761B1	W/smp	3.58E-03	6	1.67E+00	4							1.37E-03	75		
92-06761B2	W/dup	3.27E-03	6	2.12E+00	4							1.01E-03	81		
92-06761B5	W/blk			1.58E-02	5							1.98E-03	42	5.14E-04	17
92-06762B1	W/smp	3.32E-03	6	4.03E+00	4										
92-06762B2	W/dup	3.54E-03	6	5.17E+00	4							9.48E-04	79		
92-06763B1	W/smp	3.43E-03	6	1.34E+01	4							1.56E-03	42		
92-06763B2	W/dup	3.47E-03	5	1.00E+01	4							1.60E-03	44		
92-06764B1	W/smp	2.69E-03	6	8.51E+00	4							9.83E-04	79		
92-06764B2	W/dup	1.73E-03	9	6.63E+00	4										
92-06765B1	W/smp	2.36E-03	8	5.00E+00	4							8.80E-04	83		
92-06765B2	W/dup	2.34E-03	8	3.87E+00	4										
92-06766B1	W/smp	4.39E-03	5	1.12E+00	4										
92-06766B2	W/dup	2.42E-03	7	9.13E-01	4										
Core 36 - Solid Core Composite															
92-06767H1	F/smp			7.95E+02	4	1.46E-01	14								
92-06767H2	F/dup			7.90E+02	4	1.65E-01	13								
92-06767H4	F/blk			3.89E-02	5										

* A = acid digestion, F = fusion, W = water leach
 smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank

TABLE 3-2a: SST Core 36, Radiochemistry Data
Total Beta, Uranium, Tc-99, Se-79, and Sr-90

Sample ID	*	Total Beta as SrY-90 (uCi/g)	+/- % error	Sr-90 uCi/g	+/- % error	Uranium mg/g	+/- % error	Tc-99 uCi/g	+/- % error	Se-79 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 36 - Solid Core Composite											
92-06767-H-1	F/smp	1.66E+03	4	5.43E+02	7	8.89E+01	10	1.04E-01	12	4.11E-04	12
92-06767-H-2	F/dup	1.75E+03	4	4.72E+02	7	9.92E+01	10	1.09E-01	12	3.69E-04	12
92-06767-H-4	F/blk	9.1 E-02	4	< 2E-02		< 2 E-01		< 3 E-03		< 2E-04	**
92-06767-C-1	W/smp	2.03E+01	3	**		**		**		**	
92-06767-C-2	W/dup	2.69E+01	3	**		**		**		**	
92-06767-C-5	W/blk	1.99E-01	3	**		**		**		**	
Core 36 - Quarter Segment 1-C											
92-06761-A-1	F/smp	**		4.57E+02	7						
92-06761-A-2	F/dup	**		3.42E+02	8						
92-06761-A-5	F/blk	**		<3.1E-02							
Core 36 - Quarter Segment 1-D											
92-06762-A-1	F/smp	**		1.43E+01	8						
92-06762-A-2	F/dup	**		1.57E+01	8						
Core 36 - Quarter Segment 2-A											
92-06763-A-1	F/smp	**		1.49E+01	8						
92-06763-A-2	F/dup	**		2.38E+01	7						
Core 36 - Quarter Segment 2-B											
92-06764-A-1	F/smp	**		7.09E+01	7						
92-06764-A-2	F/dup	**		7.03E+01	7						
92-06764-A-5	F/blk	**		< 2.E-02							
Core 36 - Quarter Segment 2-C											
92-06765-A-1	F/smp	**		1.48E+02	7						
92-06765-A-2	F/dup	**		1.39E+02	7						
Core 36 - Quarter Segment 2-D											
92-06766-A-1	F/smp	**		1.95E+02	7						
92-06766-A-2	F/dup	**		2.03E+02	7						

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank
 ** = not requested

Table 3-2b: SST Core 36, Radiochemistry Data
Total Alpha, Am-241, Pu-238/239/240, Np-237 and Cm-242/243/244

Sample ID	*	Tot Alpha uCi/g	+/- % error	Am-241 uCi/g	+/- % error	Pu-239/240 uCi/g	+/- % error	Pu-238 uCi/g	+/- % error	Np-237 uCi/g	+/- % error	Cm-243/244 uCi/g	+/- % error	Cm-242 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 36 - Solid Core Composite															
92-06767-H-1	F/smp	1.49E-01	4	6.06E-02	11	6.44E-02	8	3.33E-03	19	4.33E-04	24	1.2E-03	9	1 E-4	24
92-06767-H-2	F/dup	1.79E-01	4	6.18E-02	5	5.41E-02	8	3.38E-03	18	3.84E-04	11	1.5E-03	8	2 E-4	19
92-06767-H-4	FA/blk	6.2 E-04	26	1.5 E-04	36	1.6 E-04	21	2.75E-04	18	6.7 E-05	27	1.3E-04	36		
92-06767-C-1	W/smp	4.59E-03	10	**		**		**		**		**			
92-06767-C-2	W/dup	7.48E-03	8	**		**		**		**		**			
92-06767-C-5	W/blk	1.55E-04	43	**		**		**		**		**			

Uranium and Plutonium Mass Percent Isotopics

Sample ID	*	Pu-238	Pu-239	Pu-240	Pu-241	Pu-242
Core 36 - Solid Core Composite						
92-06767-H-1	F/smp	0.021	95.982	3.895	0.076	0.026
92-06767-H-2	F/dup	0.025	95.792	3.990	0.129	0.065

Sample ID	*	U-234	U-235	U-236	U-238
-----------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------

Core 36 - Solid Core Composite					
92-06767-H-1	F/smp	0.0058	0.6789	0.0073	99.3080
92-06767-H-2	F/dup	0.0050	0.6769	0.0073	99.3110

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank
** = not requested

TABLE 3-2c: SST Core 36, Radiochemistry Data
H-3, C-14 and Ni63/59

Sample ID	*	H-3 uCi/g	+/- % error	C-14 uCi/g	+/- % error	Ni-63 uCi/g	+/- % error	Ni-59 uCi/g	+/- % error
Core 36 - Solid Core Composite									
92-06767-C-1	W/smp	1.59E-02	4	**		**		**	
92-06767-C-2	W/dup	1.56E-02	5	**		**		**	
92-06767-C-5	W/blk	5.18E-03	4	**		**		**	
92-06767-H-1	F/smp	**		**		2.98E-01	6	2.86E-03	27
92-06767-H-2	F/dup	**		**		3.34E-01	6	3.44E-03	27
92-06767-H-4	F/blk	**		**		4.70E-04	7	<1.9E-05	
92-06767-J-1	F/smp	**		5.6E-03	12	**		**	
92-06767-J-2	F/dup	**		1.8E-03	12	**		**	
92-06767-J-3	F/blk	**		6.3E-03	12	**		**	

* A = acid, F = fusion, W = water leach, smp = sample, dup = duplicate, blk = blank
 ** = not requested

WMC-SD-WM-DP-026
 ADDENDUM 1 REV 0
 CORE 36

WMC-EP-0640 Rev. 1

DISTRIBUTION

Number of Copies

OFFSITE

25 U.S. Department of Energy
EM-35, Trevion II
Washington, D.C. 20585

John C. Tseng

1 U.S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Operations Office
P.O. Box A
Aiken, South Carolina 29808

Thomas C. Temple

1 Charles S. Abrams
1987 Virginia
Idaho Falls, ID 83404

1 David O. Campbell
102 Windham Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

1 Fred N. Carlson
6965 North 5th West
Idaho Falls, ID 83401

1 Donald T. Oakley
409 12th Street SW, Suite 310
Washington, DC 20024-2188

1 Arlin K. Postma
3640 Ballard Road
Dallis, Oregon 97338

1 William R. Prindle
1556 Crestline Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

1 Alfred Schneider
5005 Hidden Branches Drive
Dunwoody, GA 30338

1 Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.
7201 Hamilton Blvd
Allentown, PA 18195-1501

George E. Schmauch

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

Number of Copies

OFFSITE

1 Battelle Columbus Laboratories
505 King Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201-2693

James A. Gieseke

2 Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, NY 11973

Kamal K. Bandyopadhyay
Morris Reich

1 Design Science, Inc.
163 Witherow Road
Sewickley, PA 15143

Gary Powers

1 Fauske and Associates, Inc.
16W070 W. 83rd St.
Burr Ridge, IL 60521

Hans K. Fauske

1 Florida State University
Department of Chemistry B-164
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Greg R. Choppin

1 Harvard University
295 Upland Avenue
Newton Highlands, MA 02161

Melvin W. First

1 Hazards Research Corporation
200 Valley Road, Suite 301
Mt. Arlington, NJ 07856

Chester Grelecki

9313045.0378

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

Number of Copies

OFFSITE

1	<u>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory</u> P.O. Box 808, L-221 Livermore, CA 94550 Billy C. Hudson
4	<u>Los Alamos National Laboratory</u> P.O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87545 Steve F. Agnew Steve W. Eisenhower Thomas E. Larson L. Harold Sullivan
1	<u>MIT/Department of Nuclear Engineering</u> 77 Massachusetts Ave. Room 24-102 Cambridge, MA 02139 Mujid S. Kazimi
1	<u>Nuclear Consulting Services, Inc.</u> P.O. Box 29151 Columbus, OH 43229 J. Louis Kovach
3	<u>Oak Ridge National Laboratory</u> Emory D. Collins P.O. Box 2008 7930, MS-6385 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6385 Charles W. Forsberg P.O. Box 2008 MS-6495 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6495 Thomas S. Kress P.O. Box 2009 9108, MS-8088 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8088

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)Number of CopiesONSITE

18

U.S. Department of Energy,
Richland Field Office

R. F. Christensen (8)	R3-72
J. M. Clark (3)	R3-72
R. E. Gerton	R3-72
A. G. Krasopoulos	A4-81
T. Noble	R3-72
R. O. Puthoff	A5-10
Public Reading Room	A1-65
RL Docket File (2)	A3-11

11

Pacific Northwest Laboratory

R. T. Allemann	K7-15
S. A. Bryan	P7-25
B. M. Johnson	K1-78
M. A. Lilga	P8-38
S. G. McKinley	P7-22
K. H. Pool	P8-44
R. D. Scheele	P7-25
G. F. Schiefelbein	P8-38
D. M. Strachan	K2-44
J. M. Tingey	P7-25
PNL Technical Files	K1-11

110

Westinghouse Hanford Company

H. Babad	R2-78
D. B. Bechtold	T6-09
J. R. Bell	R3-09
J. B. Billetdeaux	R2-08
R. J. Blanchard	R1-17
D. C. Board	S1-57
G. L. Borsheim	R2-11
V. C. Boyles	R1-49
J. G. Burk	B3-25
R. J. Cash (5)	R2-78
M. D. Crippen	L5-31
G. M. Christensen	H4-21
R. D. Crowe	H4-68
S. J. Dechter	R2-54
C. DeFigh-Price	R2-31

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

Number of CopiesONSITEWestinghouse Hanford Company (continued)

G. L. Dunford	R1-51
C. J. Forbes	R1-08
K. D. Fowler	R2-11
G. L. Fox	L5-01
G. T. Frater	R1-51
J. C. Fulton	R2-31
K. A. Gasper	R2-08
S. D. Godfrey	R1-51
J. M. Grigsby	H4-62
T. W. Halverson	R2-54
D. G. Hamrick	S6-15
H. D. Harmon	R2-52
J. M. Held	R3-09
J. M. Henderson	S4-55
D. L. Herting	T6-09
J. D. Hopkins	R2-11
R. D. House	R1-05
M. W. Howard	G1-75
M. N. Islam	R3-08
D. W. Jeppson	L5-31
J. R. Jewett	T6-09
D. R. Johnson	R2-08
N. W. Kirch	R2-11
W. L. Knecht	H0-34
C. A. Kuhlman	B3-30
M. Kummerer	H4-62
D. L. Lenseigne	R2-75
D. A. Marsh	A3-05
J. D. McCormack	L5-31
N. G. McDuffie	R2-78
J. M. McLaren	H0-34
J. E. Meacham	R2-78
S. J. Mech	L5-55
J. P. Menard	R2-40
J. W. Neskas	R2-11
N. J. Milliken	H4-63
A. F. Noonan	R2-12
P. C. Ohl	R1-30
M. A. Payne	R2-50
R. S. Popielarczyk	R1-30
D. N. Price	R2-14
J. G. Propson	R2-18
R. E. Raymond	R2-54
I. E. Reep	R2-08
F. R. Reich	L5-63

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

Number of Copies

ONSITE

Westinghouse Hanford Company (continued)

E. L. Renner	R2-08
D. A. Reynolds	R2-11
D. C. Richardson	R2-50
J. H. Roecker	B1-59
C. C. Scaief	L7-06
C. P. Schroeder	L7-06
M. H. Shannon	H4-61
N. L. Simon	R2-78
B. C. Simpson (10)	R2-12
S. R. Tifft	H6-26
H. Toffer	H0-38
J. D. Thomson	R1-30
R. E. Vandercook	S6-17
W. T. Watson	H0-38
R. K. Welty	R1-80
W. P. Whiting	B3-25
J. C. Wiborg	H4-60
W. D. Winkelman	L5-55
D. D. Wodrich	H0-30
D. D. Wodrich	R2-85
W. F. Zuroff	R2-14
Central Files	L8-04
Document Processing and Distribution (2)	L8-15
EDMC	H6-08
Information Release Administration (3)	R1-08
TFIC	R1-20

9313045.083

This page intentionally left blank.

9313045-0004

DISTRIBUTION (Continued)

Number of Copies

ONSITE

Westinghouse Hanford Company (continued)

E. L. Renner	R2-08
D. A. Reynolds	R2-11
D. C. Richardson	R2-50
J. H. Roecker	B1-59
C. C. Scaief	L7-06
C. P. Schroeder	L7-06
M. H. Shannon	H4-61
N. L. Simon	R2-78
B. C. Simpson (10)	R2-12
S. R. Tifft	H6-26
H. Toffer	H0-38
J. D. Thomson	R1-30
R. E. Vandercook	S6-17
W. T. Watson	H0-38
R. K. Welty	R1-80
W. P. Whiting	B3-25
J. C. Wiborg	H4-60
W. D. Winkelman	L5-55
D. D. Wodrich	H0-30
D. D. Wodrich	R2-85
W. F. Zuroff	R2-14
Central Files	L8-04
Document Processing and Distribution (2)	L8-15
EDMC	H6-08
Information Release Administration (3)	R1-08
TFIC	R1-20

9313045-0385

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**